



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1995

No. 166

## House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska].

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 25, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable BILL BARRETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Remind every person, O gracious God, that it is in giving that we receive, that we are blessed when we appreciate the unity that is Your will for us. Teach us, O God, that we can never be the people You would have us be unless we discern that our lives and hopes and dreams are intertwined with one another and that our good fortune is linked to the good fortune of others. As we have received the support of our family and friends through prayer and encouragement and counsel, so may we give of ourselves in service to others and so do the work of justice and mercy. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1026. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 201 East Pikes Peak Avenue in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "Winfield Scott Stratton Post Office."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1606. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Harry Kizirian Post Office Building."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1328. An act to amend the commencement dates of certain temporary Federal judgments.

### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1995

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that fifteen 1-minutes will be allowed on each side this morning.

### FIDEL CASTRO'S VISIT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, Cuban tyrant Fidel Castro will leave the United States after having been the catalyst for the most shameful behavior seen in a long time. It was disgusting to observe how many ignored the documented repression in Cuba.

Let me remind world leaders that while they dined with Castro, thousands of political prisoners remain in Castro's gulags. Let me remind the American media, that while they asked Castro about who will win the World Series, 11 million Cubans continue to be denied their human rights. And let me remind United States business leaders, and even some of my congressional colleagues that while they glorified Castro, Cuban workers continue to live in misery, as they are paid almost nothing in Castro's new plantation style economy.

Ironically, in the midst of its 50th anniversary celebration, the United Nations was the clear loser, for that same organization which now wants to create global taxes, accepted and idolized as one of its own, the last tyrant of the hemisphere, and turned its back on the millions of Cubans who suffer under his dictatorship. Shame on all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H 10749

## THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, for months now, I've had a hard time understanding how the Republican Members of this House could push a budget that demands huge sacrifices from the many, to lavish huge tax cuts on the few.

I've had a hard time understanding how the Republicans could double Medicare premiums and carve up middle class incomes like a Halloween pumpkin—all to give about \$20,000 a year to people who earn half-a-million dollars a year.

Above all, I've had a hard time understanding how any Member of this House could so brazenly and shamelessly turn their backs on the middle class to dole out new perks and privileges for the wealthy.

But now, I'm beginning to understand where all this injustice comes from. My Republican colleague, FREDERICK HEINEMAN of North Carolina, has given us a unique window onto the Republican world view—and why it's so weighted toward wealth and privilege.

According to Congressman HEINEMAN, his own salary—more than \$180,000 a year, and I quote, "does not make me rich. That does not make me middle class. In my opinion that makes me lower middle class." Never mind that he earns more money than 97 percent of all Americans.

Congressman HEINEMAN then builds on this delusional world view, to tell us that someone earning \$750,000 a year is simply middle class. Never mind that they earn more than 99 percent of all Americans.

I suppose in Congressman HEINEMAN's fiscal fantasy land, slashing Medicare, cutting student loans, and kicking the elderly out of nursing homes—all to pay for tax cuts for people earning hundreds of thousands of dollars per year—is a true blue middle class agenda.

But if you live in the real world, it's just plain wrong. The Republicans just don't get it. If they would step out and talk to hard-working, struggling families every once in a while, they'd understand why their views are so radical and extreme.

And then maybe they'd learn that for the vast majority of Americans, the Republican budget is more than unfair—it's more than a bunch of silly mistakes and assumptions—it's an absolute outrage. And in the name of common decency, it deserves to be denounced and defeated.

## THE 104TH CONGRESS KEEPS ITS WORD

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1993, the liberal Democrats of the 103d Con-

gress battled long and hard to raise taxes. They were successful to the tune of \$260 billion. The American people didn't like that at all. So we had us a revolution at the ballot box. A lot of the Members of the 103d Congress didn't get reelected because of the tax increase. The 104th Congress has a lot of new faces, including mine. The American people asked us to balance the budget; they asked us to return some of the money they send to Washington.

So Mr. Speaker, what will we do for the people this week? In the budget reconciliation, we will pass a balanced budget; we will cut Federal spending; and we will give back \$245 billion to the working men and women of this country. That's less than the 103d Congress took out, but it will go to help families, seniors, and the middle class. It is simply a matter of keeping our word to the American people and doing as they wish.

## THE COMEBACK CITY

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my good friend and colleague, JOHN LEWIS, stood in this well and delivered a passionate speech supporting the Atlanta Braves as they landed in Cleveland for game three of the World Series. For those who might have gone to bed early last evening, let me sum things up for you.

In comeback city, last night, the wind-chill factor hovered at 29 degrees. A little help from Mother Nature, Eddie Murray, Kenny Lofton, and José Mesa, proved to be just what the Indians needed. The team was magnificent in winning game three of the World Series.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from Atlanta, JOHN LEWIS, I would say, It ain't over 'til it's over. To the fans and players from the Atlanta Braves, I say, Welcome to Cleveland, the comeback city.

## TRAVEL AND TOURISM

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make a point. If we want a strong economy, then we have to act now. Travel and tourism is the fastest growing industry in America and in the world. Yet look at what other countries are spending on just advertising. Greece for example \$143 million. The United States is way down to \$16 million. What does that mean? That means this year we are losing a large market share. Look at what is taking place. In 1993 we had almost 19 percent; now we have less than 16 percent, and it is going down.

We want to capture this market share because what this means is that we are losing \$177,000 and \$2 billion of revenue right here. What we have to do is to have a strategy. That is why on October 30 and 31 we are having this large White House conference on travel and tourism. This is the most important conference we are going to have by far this decade because it is addressing the economy of the 1990's and the 21st century. We now have in our Travel and Tourism Caucus 304 Members. I am asking Members to join because this will be a historic week and a historic conference.

## LET US HAVE A VOTE ON YUGOSLAVIA

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I spent the weekend visiting American troops in what was Yugoslavia and those troops who are on the ground today in Italy preparing to go into what was Yugoslavia. Mr. Speaker, we are doing a lot of important things in this body. I do not think anything we do is silly. But there is nothing more important than deciding the fate of those young American men and women who have given their word to defend our country.

If this Congress does nothing, 25,000 young American men and women will be sent into a situation where they know many of them will die. This Congress will have shirked its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, we can bring that bill to the floor. We deserve a vote. Every Member of this body should decide whether or not those young men and women should be called upon, many of them to die, and a peace accord that will not bring peace to that part of the world. Tito could not do it in 50 years. The United States of America cannot do it in 1. We have to vote on this issue.

## NO UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the remarks of the preceding speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. I believe, as he does, that the President is on the verge of making the mistake of a lifetime. Without clearly defining our mission in Bosnia, without proving a compelling national interest or without a precise plan of action, the President is about to commit 20,000 to 25,000 American combat troops to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. troops should not be ordered to keep a peace where no peace exists. If Members believe peace has been achieved in the former Yugoslavia, then Members believe Elvis is

alive. The President is clearly jumping the gun in committing troops to Bosnia. It is a dangerous move and has all the makings of a very, very deadly quagmire.

Mr. Speaker, there is no plan. There is no compelling national interest to send young American men and women to die in Bosnia. Mr. Speaker, there is no compelling reason to take this action.

Let us lift the arms embargo against the Bosnian Moslems so they can defend themselves, but let us not place United States troops in a deadly situation. Let us not spend \$2 billion of American taxpayers money.

#### CONGRESS CUT NOT ONE PENNY FROM ISRAEL OR EGYPT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, everybody realizes that cuts must be made, but there is something definitely wrong here. Congress cuts seniors in America. Congress cuts housing in America. Congress cuts kids in America. Congress cuts education in America. Congress cuts farmers in America. Congress cuts services in America. Congress cuts bridges and roads in America.

I might be able to accept that, but, on the other hand, Congress did not cut one penny from the aid to Egypt or Israel. Now, a Congress that can find money for Israel and Egypt while cutting all of this in America, in my opinion, is not only misdirected but out of touch with America.

I am going to vote "no" on this budget. We should treat everybody alike; even if it is like dogs, treat everybody alike.

□ 1115

#### IT IS TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will debate H.R. 2491, the fiscal year 1996 budget reconciliation. For the first time in a generation, Congress will pass a balanced budget. By the year 2002, the deficit will be zero and we will be on our way to paying down the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing to do. For the first time in 25 years, Congress has run out of excuses for not doing the right thing for America's future. Previous Congresses totally avoided the most basic financial responsibilities. They squandered billions on frivolous, ineffective, and repetitive bureaucracies. They repeatedly raised taxes, making it appear that the problem was the American people's problem and not their own. Americans paid 37 percent of their income in Federal

taxes in 1995. Today their total is over 40 percent with Federal, State, and local taxes combined.

Last November, the American people said "enough." Republicans campaigned on a promise to balance the budget, and we will keep that promise. No excuses. No gimmicks. It is time to balance the budget.

#### A QUICK QUIZ

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. As we do budget reconciliation, a quick quiz, Mr. Speaker, three questions:

First, why are Republicans cutting Medicare and hurting seniors? A—to save the Medicare Program? B—to balance the budget? C—to pay for a tax cut for the rich?

If my colleagues said "C" they are right. The Republicans are cutting Medicare to help their rich friends.

Second, who do Republicans care most about? A—senior citizens? B—America's children? C—the B-2 bomber?

Again, if my colleagues said "C" they are correct. While the Republicans are cutting Federal funding to Medicare and education, they are increasing funding for the B-2 bomber, what even the Pentagon says we do not need.

Third, which programs will be protected under Republican proposals? A—Social Security? B—Medicare? C—Pork barrel projects in Republican districts?

Again, the answer is "C." While Republicans are hurting seniors by reducing their Social Security and Medicare benefits, they are conducting business as usual by increasing funding for fat cat projects.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all three answers were "C."

I guess the "C" stands for cuts—Republican cuts. Cut the heart out of our seniors by raiding Medicare. Cut the heart out of our children's education. Cut the heart out of America's future.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE UNDERSTAND IT IS TIME FOR FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] play a game that really should be called, Who does he think he's fooling? I at least was happy it was a multiple-choice test because we will provide seniors something that has been lacking in health care for the last three decades, a choice, the most fundamental element of American freedom, the freedom to choose what health care plan is best for them, and once again, Mr. Speaker, only in Washington, with the twisted Washington mathematics of

the guardians of the old order, can an increase from \$4,800 this year to \$6,700 in the year 2002 be considered a cut. How is that a cut? It is an increase of almost \$2,000.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will not be fooled. They understand it is time for fundamental change. That is why we were sent here, and that is why we will change things for the better.

#### THIS IS NOT A FAIR BUDGET

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, good morning. Balancing the budget may be a good idea. Tax breaks for the wealthy is not. I want to talk about Medicaid.

In this so-called reconciliation bill the Republicans cut \$182 billion out of Medicaid. Now some people are saying, "There you go, talking about the poor again." No, I am talking about the elderly, the disabled, and the blind. They had not one public hearing. They cut \$182 billion. They tell us, well, it is to make things better for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, the future is now. The future is my parents, my colleagues' parents. It is my colleagues' parents, my colleagues' grandparents, my colleagues' aunts, and my colleagues' uncles who are in these nursing homes. In the year 2002, when they tell us they will have a great balanced budget, they will also be spending 30 percent less on Medicaid. They also are eliminating the standards that protect seniors from oversaturation, protect their nutrition, protect their health standards in nursing homes.

The other night I met with the Alzheimer's support group. They are worried. They are concerned that they may have to spend their children's college education to support their parents in nursing homes. They are concerned that the elderly are sometimes eating cat food because they cannot afford it.

This is not a fair budget, and they worsen the pain by adding tax breaks for the rich. We need to protect our seniors. Reject the Republican budget approach.

#### REPUBLICAN MAJORITY DELIVERS CLINTON'S CAMPAIGN PROMISE FOR A TAX CUT

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's reelection campaign is now in full swing, so once again he has flip-flopped his position on taxes. Now the President admits that he raised taxes too much in his 1993 budget. Let us listen to what the pundits around this Nation are saying:

Eleanor Clift said, "This is just one notch below 'Read my lips.'"

Margaret Carlson said, "It was pandering of the worst sort, and it's indefensible."

Morton Kondracke said, "It's evidence of a character disorder on Bill Clinton's part."

Mr. Speaker, candidate Bill Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut, but then President Bill Clinton raised taxes on the American people. This week the Republican majority will deliver on those promised tax cuts, and it is about time.

#### WE CANNOT ALLOW THIS RECONCILIATION TO TAKE OUR ECONOMY HOSTAGE

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today, as we begin debating the reconciliation, we are debating nothing less than the path the United States will take in the future. On issues from education to the environment, health care to nutrition, the choices we make will have an impact for many years.

But of all the choices we make, none is more critical than this: We cannot allow our very significant differences over reconciliation to take our economy hostage. We cannot allow a failure to raise the debt ceiling to force America into default.

I want to make just two simple points (about this): First, no matter how stringent the budget action we take this week, the debt ceiling will still have to be raised. There is no way to avoid it without pushing us into default.

And second, no one knows what the consequences of default could be because it has never happened before. I, for one, see a real potential for worldwide economic disruption. I urge my colleagues to avoid politics or grandstanding on this incredibly important issue.

#### TAXES ARE KILLING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, enough of the rhetoric from the other side. We are engaged in a great debate here about the budget, about the issue of tax cuts or deficit relief.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard the minority leader come to this floor and say the Republicans were out of touch. He said they ought to take a step out and talk to real working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, he did not know what I did last weekend because last weekend I spent hours in front of grocery stores and drug stores in any district, and I asked the American people the question my colleagues and I are debating, "Do you need tax relief?" And their answer, and I did this in a working-class

neighborhood in my district with real people, was that we need tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, one of them said, "Taxes are killing the American people."

Now the other side calls this tax relief for the rich, but that is garbage, and they know it. Rich people do not have any more children than poor people.

As young ladies walked up to me with one baby in their arms and another dragging along behind them, I asked them, "Could you use a thousand dollars' tax credit?"

Mr. Speaker, they said to me, "You bet I could."

I ask my colleagues, "Whose money is it, and who can better spend it?" That side says government can spend it better. I say we can spend it better by giving it to the American people.

#### WELCOME TO THE GINGRICH REVOLUTION

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues say their tax package benefits the middle class. I guess it all depends on how you define middle class.

In today's Washington Post one Republican Congressman explains that GOP tax credits for people making \$200,000 a year are not tax breaks for the wealthy, because people making \$200,000 a year are not wealthy, they are lower middle class.

The Congressman is quoted as saying: "When I see someone who is making anywhere from \$300,000 to \$750,000 a year, that's middle class."

If Republicans consider a person making \$750,000 a year as middle class, I am beginning to understand how they can claim that this budget helps the middled class. In fact, by GOP calculations, NEWT GINGRICH might qualify for food stamps. Except there would not be food stamps, because they are being cut to help out those poor, struggling families making \$750,000 a year. Welcome to the Gingrich revolution.

#### A PATRIOTIC OBJECTION

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a courageous young man named Michael New is to be arraigned for a court martial.

Mr. New's offense is that he refused to wear the blue uniform of the United Nations on a peacekeeping mission to Macedonia.

He has not refused to go overseas on the peacekeeping mission as ordered.

He simply has taken the position that his oath upon entering military service was to the United States—not the United Nations—and he wanted to wear his U.S. Army uniform.

Obviously, this young man loves America, and he has taken a very patriotic stand.

Most Americans believe that the young men and women in our Armed Forces should not be sent overseas except under the command of American generals and admirals.

The Members of Congress who are the most concerned with the treatment of Mr. New are generally the Members who are among the strongest supporters of the U.S. military.

Our Armed Forces are going to squander a great deal of public and congressional support if they continue to prosecute Michael New.

They could easily have found other duty for someone who was making a reasonable, principled, and patriotic objection as was Mr. New.

#### RECONCILIATION WITH A "W"

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I talked about the words that the Gingrich revolution uses to sneak up on people and make them think that they are all warm fuzzies. Reconciliation is one of those words. It sounds so warm and wonderful, but let me say, unless you are in the middle class that the Republicans have had defined by them, by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman HEINEMAN, as those people from \$300,000 a year to \$750,000, unless you are in that middle class, reconciliation is spelled this way for you.

This is really "wreconciliation" for the middle class. That is where I am, and I think we need to go into this much further and point it out before this all happens and before people are lulled to sleep.

What happens to the elderly? Boom. What happens to families? Boom. What happens to children? Boom. We are going to wreck families, children, and all sorts of people's sustainable income that has kept them in what we define as the middle class.

So, pull it away, and away they fall. This is wreconciliation; do not be fooled by the word.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT BUDGET RECONCILIATION

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, Jay Thomas, who lives in Wichita, KS, said, "I would just like to know where I could go to hear the truth," and, as we heard before, supposedly we snuck up on people, because he heard that nutrition programs were being cut and that children would starve, but there have been no reports of children starving. In fact, nutrition programs are up 4 percent in the Republican budget.

My colleagues heard that Medicare was at a \$270 billion cut. Yet it has gone from \$4,800 per year to \$6,700 per year with more people in the system in 7 years, an increase. Plus it has a lockbox provision so any savings goes right back into providing more health care and not for tax breaks for the rich like we would hear some other people allegedly saying.

And tax breaks for the rich; let us talk about that. When he knows that women who have three children are driving to work this morning so they can provide for those children and the tax breaks, I want that young woman to know that she will get \$1,500, \$1,500, of a tax break. She is not rich, she is poor.

So where is the credibility? Listen, Jay. The truth is that we are going to balance the budget to preserve a future for the children. We are going to preserve and protect Medicare. We are going to reform welfare, requiring work, bringing the work ethic back in, and we are going to give tax breaks to families, all under the 7-year balanced budget Reconciliation Act.

□ 1130

#### SUPPORT THE COALITION BUDGET

(Mr. PAYNE of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if you could vote for a bill that would balance the budget in 7 years, cut the deficit faster and deeper than any plan now on the table, and achieve real budget process reforms, would you?

That's the choice every Member of this House will face tomorrow when the House votes on the Budget Reconciliation Act. We can vote for the bill that was written by the Republican leadership, or we can vote for a better plan, the substitute bill that was developed by the conservative Democratic Coalition.

It is the coalition's budget that spends less of our constituents' hardearned money over 7 years.

It is the coalition's budget that contains real budget process reforms like a line item veto that applies right now and a deficit reduction lockbox that can't be picked.

And it is the coalition's budget says its wrong to borrow money from our kids to pay for big tax cuts right now.

But that's not all, Mr. Speaker.

Because the coalition rejects tax cuts and doesn't backload its spending cuts as the Republican plan does, we are able to provide \$100 billion more for Medicare and \$100 billion more for Medicaid than their plan. And we don't slash spending for student loans and agriculture.

The conservative Democratic Coalition's budget is tough and it is fair. It's a better deal for your constituents and mine. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

#### SUPPORT TAX CUTS

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week in my home State of Texas the President admitted what Republicans and the American people already knew—he raised taxes too much.

Two short years ago Mr. Clinton and the Democrats raised America's taxes by \$258 billion, the largest tax increase in American history.

Republicans now want to return that money back to hardworking Americans by providing tax cuts for families, for seniors, and for America's jobcreating businesses. It is time to put the people back in charge of their wallets. Let's get government out of our pockets.

It's nice to see the President admit his own mistake. Fortunately it's not too late for him to right his wrong, he can let all Americans keep more of what they earn. Support tax cuts and sign the budget. It's good for America.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS SCORN RURAL AMERICA

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this week we will vote on proposed budget cuts that ignore the past, disregard the present, and worse: Scorns the future, especially for rural America.

Scorn is a harsh word to use in describing the impact of Republican budget cuts on our children, but consider what these cuts will do to rural children in North Carolina.

Almost a quarter of a million needy children in North Carolina, and 4½ million nationwide will be dropped from Medicaid.

More than 60,000 North Carolina young people will be denied a summer job, 4,000 will lose Head Start, and all 129 school districts will lose money for Safe and Drug Free Schools, affecting threequarters of a million rural children.

Nutrition assistance for North Carolina children is cut by more than 20 percent, \$500 million, affecting 320,000 children.

When combined with housing cuts affecting thousands of North Carolina children, the elimination of heating assistance from 200,000 children, and the denial of child care help for 20,000 children—scorn may not be a harsh enough word—cruel and inhuman might be more appropriate choices.

#### HELP THE POOR BY CUTTING TAXES

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we debate tax cuts this week, I think we should look to the example of President Reagan.

In 1981, President Reagan cut taxes, setting off the longest peacetime expansion in American history. What happened during the ensuing decade?

More than 19 million high paying jobs were created.

Real median family income increased 13 percent.

The number of Americans trapped in poverty dropped by 4 million.

The rich carried a greater percentage of the tax burden.

Now listen carefully. Of those in the bottom fifth income bracket in 1979, 65 percent jumped at least two income brackets during the 1980's. And more made it to the top income bracket than stayed in the bottom.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do you want to help the poor? Well then, cut taxes.

#### FOCUS SHOULD BE ON THE CHILDREN

(Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Humphrey once said that "the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

I would like to focus on the children. In the United States today, a child is born into poverty every 30 seconds.

Yet my Republican colleagues are systematically throwing millions of lower middle class families with children into poverty.

By cutting Medicaid, school lunch programs, student loans, low income heating assistance, the earned income tax credit, Federal housing assistance, aid for families with dependent children, and education they are cutting short the hopes of the children of this country.

These cuts will push millions of children into the shadows of life, and into lives of uncertainty, insecurity, and poverty.

In the United States, every 30 seconds a baby is born into poverty. Are we now shooting for every 15 seconds?

At some point, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle must ask themselves if giving a tax break to the wealthiest Americans is worth the cost of our children.

#### PASSING THE RECONCILIATION BILL IS THE BEST THING CONGRESS CAN DO FOR THE AMERICAN ECONOMY AND THE POOR

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot from the other side of the aisle about why we should not balance the budget, we should not reduce Federal regulations, and why we should not cut taxes. Let me recommend to my doubting colleagues that they get hold of the recent DRI-McGraw-Hill report on the economic impact of the reconciliation bill we will soon be considering. According to that study, the reconciliation bill will "bring down interest rates for fixed rate mortgages by 2.7 percentage points, and those for adjustable mortgages by 1.7 percentage points by the year 2000."

The result, said DRI, would be an 8-percent boost in home values, and an increase in household net worth for Americans of over \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, passing this reconciliation bill is the best thing we can do for the people of our country, the middle class and the poor. No Government spending program could ever come close to achieving what balancing the budget will do, if we just have the courage to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President will put aside politics for a while and join us to balance this budget.

#### URGING MEMBERS TO COSPONSOR BILL TO CREATE A NATIONAL COMMISSION TO STUDY GAMBLING

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to let the Members know that we now have 92 cosponsors on our bill to create a national commission to study the impact of gambling in the United States. Twenty years ago only two States had gambling. Now almost every State but Hawaii and Utah has gambling.

This is a bipartisan bill. We have the majority whip and the minority whip. It is time we pass it, whereby we can have a study to see, is there a problem of corruption? We know corruption does follow. Is there a problem of crime? Is there a problem of organized crime? Is there a problem of teenage addiction? Let us find out. Let us have a national commission to examine it.

The bill is being cosponsored in the Senate by Senator SIMON from Illinois, and Senator LUGAR from Indiana. We hope to pass it in the House this year and pass it in the Senate this year. I urge all my colleagues who are not cosponsors, please call my office today to cosponsor the bill, H.R. 497, National Commission to Study the Impact of Gambling.

#### THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET: THE BIGGEST GAMBLE OF THE DECADE

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the House, with its budget, is set for the biggest gamble of the decade. The gamble is to reduce the deficit. I do not think it will do that. More important, it is going to increase the human deficit, the human suffering in this country. It reneges on the basic commitments we have had to decency and to families.

In fact, speaking of unfairness, last week's Wall Street Journal pointed out that the Republican tax breaks increases taxes for those under \$30,000 income, because it eliminates part of the earned income tax credit; because the child tax credit you have been hearing about does not help low-income people.

In fact, of course, it cuts programs like education, Medicaid, school lunches. The Medicaid program is completely decimated by this Republican budget measure. We are going to see the reopening of the institutions for the disabled in our States. There is going to be inadequate funds to meet basic health needs.

The Governors in this country, good Governors they may be, are not capable of the miracle of loaves and fishes. They cannot make something out of nothing. That is what they are being handed by the GOP proposed programs. A block grant. This has all the grace of cement blocks being dropped on our States. These block grants are going to deliver stones back home in place of help. This Republican plan will especially hurt children—16 million kids receive Medicaid; they need their health care, education, and nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, reject this, reject the tax breaks for the affluent. Let us keep our commitments to our American families and to the kids, our hope for tomorrow. Let's not gamble away the children's milk, health, and school money.

#### ACCURATE PERSONAL REMARKS TAKEN OUT OF CONTEXT BY THE DEMOCRATIC MINORITY

(Mr. HEINEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the depth of the Democratic agenda is no deeper than a bumper sticker. Their whole agenda in this 104th Congress has been out of context remarks, lies, and distortions. That is the depth of their initiatives.

The minority leader, in his failure to keep his party together, is now desperately clutching for straws. The remarks of myself, FRED HEINEMAN, in an informal discussion with his hometown paper as to what and who are rich, were completely taken out of context. Now they have been incorporated into the Democratic platform to defeat the Republican initiatives to save this country.

My remarks were directed to my situation and my situation alone. Each person can better judge where he or she

stands as it relates to the variables of their economic status. Mine were accurate for me and others like me.

#### BULK SALES OF BUDGET RECONCILIATION PACKAGE

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot lately about possible bulk sales of NEWT GINGRICH's book.

Yes, reports say GINGRICH is doing exactly what he accused a former Speaker of. But, guess what? His \$2 million book is not the only thing NEWT GINGRICH is trying to sell in bulk. Here's the new book—the GOP's 1,500 page, budget-busting reconciliation package. In it, NEWT GINGRICH is going to try to sell—in bulk—some gems of fiction that you just won't believe.

He'll try to sell you on the idea that we should give a tax cut to the wealthy few while we cancel tax credits for the working poor. And he wants you to buy into the fiction that students don't ever need a college loan.

NEWT GINGRICH called his first book: "To Renew America."

He should call this one: "How to Undo America," undoing decades of what is good and decent and fair. This book might not be a best-seller, but it certainly is a good example of how to sell-out.

#### REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF S. 1060, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1060) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which has passed the Senate, and proceed to its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I have here the Republican whip notice saying here that the first item of business this morning will be the legislative branch appropriations, and the very gift ban and lobby reform the gentleman refers to.

Is it true that after the vote of the Democratic Caucus calling for immediate gift ban reform this morning, that that has been pulled from the agenda and we will not have a chance to have a gift ban reform and lobby reform considered today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot comment on that particular inquiry. The Chair will recognize the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs.

WALDHOLTZ], for the purpose of calling a privileged rule.

□ 1145

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2002,  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 241

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under this particular resolution, is the legislative branch appropriation affected by this particular rule, or is it exclusively the Transportation branch?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This rule will make in order the Department of Transportation Appropriation conference report.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, since the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] has herself circulated a letter on this gift ban issue, does this resolution and rule permit the offering of gift ban or lobby reform legislation, as the Republican whip notice said we would have an opportunity to consider this morning?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This rule does not relate to that subject.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] is recognized.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 241 provides for the consideration of the conference report for H.R. 2002, the fiscal year 1996 transportation appropriations bill. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report. The waiver covers provisions relating to legislation and unauthorized items on a general appropriations bill and, further, protects cer-

tain provisions which exceed the scope of differences between the House and the Senate.

Waivers under the rule are in accordance with previous tradition on appropriations conference reports, and in fact, the rule was reported out of committee on a voice vote with no controversy or opposition.

H.R. 2002 provides critical funding for improving and investing in our Nation's infrastructure and transportation needs. For example, the bill increases funding for the Federal Aviation Administration in order to improve aviation safety. It provides \$1.45 billion for the airport improvement program, which is the same level of spending as last year, and provides \$19.9 billion for total highway program spending.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the bill recognizes the need to restructure and downsize the Federal Government. This bill includes provisions to terminate the Interstate Commerce Commission, reduce transit operating assistance funds, and cut administrative expenses of the Department of Transportation, including a requirement to consolidate the Department's extensive field offices, for a savings of \$25 million.

Mr. Speaker, importantly, this bill also changes how we make our funding decisions in this Congress. This bill totally eliminates funding for highway demonstration projects, which previously were a way to funnel more money to favored lawmakers' districts, and instead uses these funds for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Under this bill, we spend next year virtually all of the highway trust funds collected instead of stockpiling those funds to mask the true size of the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects fiscal responsibility, and at the same time provides sufficient funding for our transportation and infrastructure needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding me the customary one-half hour of debate time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do not oppose this rule. It is a traditional rule for a conference report on an appropriations bill, waiving all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

However, we would like to point out to the membership our concerns about the legislation that the rule makes in order, which provides appropriations for transportation programs for fiscal 1996.

Our primary concern is that this bill shortchanges, we believe, many valuable services that the American people have come to depend upon for the safe-

ty and reliability of our Nation's transportation systems. For example, the legislation cuts AMTRAK rail passenger service by \$158 million; it cuts the Coast Guard by \$281 million; it cuts the Federal Transit Administration by \$563 million; and it cuts the Federal Aviation Administration by \$178 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that the House Democratic conferees took unanimous exception to one provision in the conference report, amendment number 174, which allows the Federal Aviation Administration Administrator to waive current law pertaining to labor management and employee relations. The reasons for our Members' objections to this particular provision will be one of the issues discussed during the course of debate on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat: we have no objections to this rule, and we urge its passage so that the House can proceed to consideration of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for additional time at this point, and so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I basically take the floor to talk about the FAA, because this is a rule bringing up the transportation appropriations in which the FAA is getting more money.

Let me say that I am here today pleading with the FAA to please, please come clean with the Denver media and the people who live in Denver. Let me tell you why.

Mr. Speaker, many of you know we had a huge snowstorm. We have a brandnew airport. I think people have read a lot about that new airport, and they read a lot of negative things about what happened in the control tower at that airport during the snowstorm. The roof started leaking like mad. They had water coming down over all of the instruments. They were putting plastic over all of the instruments. The problem has been that the FAA will not let even one camera in there to see it.

Yesterday another tile fell on one of the air traffic controllers' heads. Luckily, she was not hurt, but they made her sign all sorts of statements and all sorts of everything else. They have also had to remove two air traffic controllers, take them out of service because apparently the leaks are so bad that there is no place to sit in those positions.

Now, here is the problem: Denver is getting dinged for all of this. Everybody is going to laugh at Denver, laugh at Colorado. Denver did not build that tower. That tower was totally under the control of the Federal Aviation Authority. They oversaw it, and they



built it. They selected a contractor who has had, I guess, some problems in the past with roofs. That has been the rumor; but whatever, they ought to be big enough to come out and talk about the problems.

No one expects a brandnew facility like this to kind of open up and leak like it did when this kind of a storm comes through, then to be in this state of denial where they are denying access so cameras cannot even come in and to refuse to come out and really talk to people about what you are going to do to get this up and going is very troubling.

There were some other problems with the ground radar. I understand, and I was very pleased, that the FAA was out there, they went out, they looked at it, they decertified it, but then they recertified it and turned it back on. Many of the people we have talked to out there have said that they just turned it off, they turned it on, it did not solve the problem. It is not seen in that corner of the airport where it was seen at the time the almost-accident occurred.

So we do not want the FAA trying to paint over that either and put a happy face on it.

Mr. Speaker, the FAA has had a model record in the world for air traffic safety, and I absolutely cannot figure out why we are kind of getting the brushoff and why they are not dealing straight with the Denver media. If they want to keep this reputation, they have to come clean. This is not a fungus. It can thrive in sunshine, but if they do not let it in the sunshine, people will wonder what kind of a fungus the FAA is growing.

The taxpayers and everyone else made a huge investment. This investment was to add to the capacity. This airport would have been totally closed down in this storm had it been the old airport. This is to be an all-weather airport. When you have the air traffic control tower built so poorly that you are going to have water coming in and people are having to read the instruments under plastic because the water might short something out, and now you cannot even have as many people up there and you cannot even let the cameras in to see it because no one wants to admit it happened on their watch. That is why people are cynical about government.

So I plead with the FAA, I plead with them, to go and come clean. Let the media see what happened, tell us how you are going to fix that. Do not put it on my city. They did not do that. You oversaw it. Take the responsibility. Stand up, stand for something, because I think the citizens of Colorado are getting to be a little impatient with all of this, everybody pointing at everyone else and then locking the doors so nobody can really get in and see.

If the contractor made a mistake, go get the contractor. Tell us how you are going to fix it. Make sure that airport does what the taxpayers paid for: Be-

come the best all-weather and the safest all-weather airport in the world.

I am a pilot. I understand how important that is. We were so proud of how it worked on the opening day when we had a terrible, terrible snowstorm and everything went like this. The ceiling did not collapse or leak at that point and the ground radar was working properly, I guess, at that point.

Mr. Speaker, we want it to work. This is like getting a new car and it falls down as you drive it out of the showroom. Get it fixed, FAA, because we are getting impatient.

Mr. BEILSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what is happening here this morning is truly amazing. By this rule, we set the order of debate here in this House, and last night we were given an indication of what the order of debate would be, and again, as recently as a few hours ago this morning we were given an indication of what the order of debate would be in the official Republican whip notice. That order was to consider the legislative branch appropriations bill. With that in mind, the Democratic Caucus met this morning and overwhelmingly voted to support the gift ban legislation, the gift ban rule to be more specific, that the Senate has approved on a bipartisan basis 98 to 0.

However, for some reason, bipartisanship in this building stops in the middle of the Capitol rotunda, because instead of dealing with the issue of gifts this morning, we are dealing with another piece of legislation all along. What has happened is, a giant pulled stamp should be put on the legislative appropriations bill. Right after the Democratic Caucus votes for reform, and tries to change business as usual here, deal with this issue of gifts, what happens? The measure is pulled.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that it is appropriate for this body to focus on reforming itself before, not after, it deals with all of these substantive issues. It is particularly ironic, given the fact that the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] has circulated a letter to all of her colleagues in favor of gift ban reform, and yet we have had opportunity after opportunity after opportunity to vote on it, not just to talk about it, not just to issue a press release about it, not just to posture about it, but to vote about it and do something about these gifts, and the Republican majority has continually voted the other way, voted against reform from the first day of this session when a gift ban item came up. Through June, twice, through July, and in October of this year, the last time the legislative branch appropriations were up, the same thing happened, and now today, when we have an opportunity to look in this box and see what gifts people can still be given, the snow is about to fall, I understand, in Colorado, where the gentlewoman from Colorado just spoke.

You need a trip to the ski slopes? It is still permitted. You need a little chateaubriand and Cabernet Sauvignon? It is still permitted. Do you need tickets to the World Series or the Super Bowl? It is still permitted to be a gift to Members of this body. The only thing that is preventing that problem being dealt with here as our colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike have dealt with it in the U.S. Senate, is the obstructionism and the objection of Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership.

Indeed, the first vote that we took on this issue when every single Republican voted against gift reform was on the first day of this session, where people stood at this very spot and said, let us change business as usual, let us clean up the relationship between legislators and lobbyists, and the response of Speaker GINGRICH to that initiative was that "it was an astonishingly narrow and self-destructive act."

□ 1200

What a comment by those who claim to be revolutionaries, who say they really want to change the way business operates in this House. It is time to address the issue of gifts, and no amount of press releases and no amount of speeches can make up for the continual delay. At every opportunity immediately after action is called for and a united Democratic Caucus gets behind this issue, the Members of the Republican Party jerk it from the agenda.

The American people are not going to stand for continual delay, for continued obstructionism, for continued objection to really changing the way this business of the Congress operates. They want an open House. They want the kind of revolution they were promised but have not gotten from our Republican colleagues.

This is a bill about transportation. It deals with railroads. It deals with highways. It deals with airplanes. Whether you fly, you ride the rails, or you take a trip somewhere, this can still occur today under the rules that do not apply in this House.

Last year the Democratic Congress, before I ever got here, passed a rule to deal with that, passed it twice, and it was killed by Republicans in the Senate.

This year we have asked for action on it again. All we get is it pulled from the agenda so that the legitimate desires of the American people to deal with the issue of real reform in this body, changing business as usual, have been thwarted. If the American people make their voice known that they want real change, not just phony change, we are going to get that change.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad to have an opportunity to talk about what is really happening on gift ban legislation in this Congress. I am very encouraged, Mr. Speaker, that



we are going to have an opportunity to give this issue the full hearing and vote on the floor that it deserves.

The gentleman who just spoke objected to the fact that one item was pulled from the legislative agenda today. However, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to note that last night pursuant to a request from the minority there was a unanimous-consent agreement entered into to add 3 hours of general debate on the budget reconciliation package. The minority asked for that time; the majority decided to accede to their request, a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into.

As a result, another item was pulled from the schedule to allow that 3 hours of debate to be added to our agenda for today.

But in particular, Mr. Speaker, on the gift ban legislation, last week those of us who have been working on this legislation from the beginning of this Congress received a commitment from our leadership, from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, that by the end of this week he would make an announcement as to when we would take up the gift ban legislation. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that yesterday, Mr. ARMEY, in a discussion personally with me, reaffirmed his commitment that by the end of Friday of this week, he will make an announcement as to when we will take up a vote on the gift ban legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we allow this legislation to go through the hearing process before this measure comes to the floor for a vote. I am not so vain, Mr. Speaker, as to believe that the bill is perfect in the way that I introduced it, because the gentleman said that I have circulated a letter on gift ban. I have done more than that, Mr. Speaker. I am the sponsor of the gift ban legislation that I hope will come, that I believe will be the vehicle that we will discuss when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, makes his announcement.

But I am not so vain, Mr. Speaker, as to believe that that bill cannot be improved through the hearing process. It has not gone through the hearing process yet. That will be a part of the announcement that will come later this week.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minority party this morning voted in conference to support the gift ban bill. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have had some difficulty in getting some cosponsors from the other side of the aisle. The gentleman from California, Mr. BEILENSEN, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, was one of the very first to join me in sponsoring that gift ban legislation. I appreciate that.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we welcome their support and invite them, including the gentleman who previously spoke, who is not yet a

cosponsor of that legislation, to join us in cosponsoring that legislation, so that, when we move it to the floor, we can have true bipartisan support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be sure that I am clear about what the gentlewoman has said. As I understand, her position is we do not take up gift ban this morning because we will have an announcement of a time at some future time, sometime this year, next year, when the majority leader will tell us that we can take up gift ban.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are not taking up gift ban this morning because it is not germane to the Transportation appropriations bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, and with reference to the scheduling, she is not suggesting, I am sure she was here when I queried the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], about this at the conclusion of business last night. She is not suggesting that the additional 3 hours of debate which was scheduled for tonight until the legislative branch appropriations was pulled, that that has anything to do with this gift ban, is she?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I was not here when the gentleman discussed this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] last night. But I do know that the majority leader felt that it was important to allow the 3 hours of general debate that colleagues on his side of the aisle requested. And so this measure was pulled in an attempt to provide the gentleman with the time that his side has requested.

Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we move on. This is not germane to the discussion of the rule that we are discussing.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just was wanting to make clear, the gentlewoman said that there is going to be hearings on the gift ban legislation before it comes to the floor.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the majority leader will be announcing by the end of the this week, as he announced last week, a time at which we will take up gift ban legislation. As the sponsor of the measure, it certainly is my intent and I have expressed that to my leadership and believe that they will follow through with that to provide for a hearing to see if this is a measure that cannot be improved in some way.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, one of the concerns I have had, and I just am sharing this for information, is that once we introduce and pass a bill here that is different from

the one adopted in the Senate, it never becomes law.

We have seen that one of the reasons we have never gotten this passed is this body has passed it before, and it goes to the other body, and it dies, or they pass a different one or they never get together.

What I was hoping is that we could accept what the other body has done and then start with that as a new higher level of morality on this issue to then begin a new, a higher debate. Otherwise, I fear, if we go to hearings, I mean we did not even have hearings on Medicare or Medicaid.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report to the gentlewoman that whatever we do this gift ban does not need to go back to the Senate because the gift ban is a rule of the House and will not need to be acted on by the other body. So we have complete latitude within the House to do what we feel is appropriate without having to consult with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again, as my good friend from Utah has, remind our colleagues that we are debating the rule on the transportation appropriations legislation. I think that that is something that we should recognize.

I was just a few minutes ago walking out in the Speaker's hallway and was headed back up to the Committee on Rules where we are at this point considering the rule for the reconciliation bill which will begin, as was said earlier, debate this evening and go through tomorrow.

I heard the statement of my very good friend from Texas somehow implying, or I inferred from this, that we had not proceeded with the kinds of reforms that he believed were necessary. I have got to say that, having authored the opening day reforms, having worked with, and I see my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], during 1993 on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that was established. And he worked on the issue of congressional reform before; we spent hours and hours and hours.

We had 37 hearings in 1993; 243 witnesses came before us in 1993. The former majority leadership, as everyone knows, did absolutely nothing with the report that came forward. It was not until we won this new majority, and frankly many Democrats on a regular basis remind me of this, it was not until we won the new majority that we were able to implement the greatest reforms that this institution has seen in a half century.

We all know what those reforms have been. They have been for the most part received extraordinarily well: changing the committee structure, eliminating

proxy voting, insisting on congressional compliance with laws imposed on other Americans.

To claim that nothing has been done in the area of reform, as many have, unfortunately, is absolutely preposterous.

My friend from Utah is the sponsor, as she has just said, of legislation dealing with the gift ban issue. As we look at overhauling the entire makeup of the Federal Government, this clearly is a priority and something that we are going to be considering. But I believe that it is crazy to in any way imply that this historic 104th Congress has not brought about major reforms. I hope very much that the American people and our colleagues will recognize that.

With that, I urge strong support of this rule that is being carried by my friend.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague from California, while he may have made some changes that Democrats recommended in the last Congress, when it came to separating the lobby and the legislators, he has done absolutely nothing. The only lobby this group cares about are the Girl Scouts and Catholic charities. They are all worked up about them lobbying. But when it comes to polluters, when it comes to loophole lawyers, they have done nothing but to fill this box to overflowing with gifts for Members of this House.

The comments of the gentlewoman from Utah are absolutely amazing. I stood on this floor last night and asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] myself about the schedule for today. There was no suggestion that there would not be time today to take up the issue of gifts. Quite the contrary, he indicated we would be debating on into the evening with reference to this issue.

The suggestion that we need to have a hearing is an unusual one because the lobby reform bill, if the gentlewoman will go up to the Speaker's dais, she will find it sitting there. It has been sitting there since it passed the Senate, not even a referral from the Speaker of the lobby reform bill.

With reference to the gift ban itself, it is true that there was a secret closed-door meeting in front of the Ethics Committee concerning the possibility of a gift ban. They have had weeks and months to act on it, just as this body has had an opportunity to act. The suggestion that we ought to delay again today in order to wait not for action but for another promise from the majority leader that maybe some day, some year, some week, some month we will get around to doing something about this problem of gifts and lobby reform is the only thing crazy that I have heard, with all due respect to the gentleman from California who used that phrase.

I suggest that, when the House has had an opportunity to vote on this measure and has been continually thwarted, it is time to give us an opportunity to take up the issue again today. There is no reason, this body will finish its business by mid-afternoon under this new schedule. There is absolutely no way that this Congress cannot reform itself today, if we were permitted to do so.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply remind the body that we are trying to move forward on a rule for the transportation appropriations budget. I think it is important that we move forward so that we can reach the other items on our agenda today, not only this bill. We have important discussions to enter into regarding the budget reconciliation bill, which is probably the most important bill that this Congress will take up this year.

So I would simply say to my colleague that I do not think it is asking too much of our majority leader to be able to wait until Friday of this week to make an announcement as to when we will take up the gift ban measure and discuss other congressional reform measures beyond that which we have discussed here today so that we have an opportunity to finish the budget reconciliation bill, which we must move forward on today and tomorrow. Then the very next day we can expect an announcement as to when we are going to move this important gift ban legislation and other congressional reforms forward.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who feel so strongly about this issue to join me in sponsoring this legislation, as some of them have not yet done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Utah that we appreciate her patience. If she will give us about 5 minutes more, we will be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up on some of the comments that were made by my colleague from Texas because I think he has made some important points.

I have been involved, as the gentlewoman from Utah knows, in the bipartisan effort to reform this institution. I do so because I fervently believe that institutional reform is not a Democratic issue. It should not be a Democratic issue. It should not be a Republican issue. It should be an issue that brings the parties together because it is an issue that strikes at the integrity of this institution.

I have to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that I have been frustrated over the

last 8 or 9 months because it reminds me about Lucy holding that football for Charlie Brown. Each time we get close to being able to debate these issues and bring them to the floor, the football is taken away. Another reason is given to us as to why we cannot debate gift reform and lobbying reform. I think it is important that we keep those two issues together.

□ 1215

I certainly will be encouraged if we do have a date certain for gift ban reform to be brought to this floor. I think it is important that we do so, but we cannot forget that equally important issue of lobbying reform. I find it somewhat perplexing and ironic that now the leadership wants to divide these two issues, bring the gift ban reform to the floor, but not bring the lobbying reform to the floor. Now why is this? Why do we not want to move them together? Both bills or both measures have gone through the Senate. They are both in excellent shape. We should have the opportunity to debate these and move them forward.

I think that this legislative appropriations vehicle is a very good vehicle, and for my friends on the other side of the aisle who have not been through this exercise before, I can assure them that there are people, mostly people who have been around here many, many years longer than we have, who want to love these issues to death. That is what they want to do, they want to love these issues to death. They do not want these issues brought to the floor, and they are going to find as many ways as they can to kill it.

That reminds me a little bit of the Paul Simon song "Fifty Ways To Leave Your Lover." They are going to find 50 ways to make sure these measures do not go into effect to affect this institution.

So, I think the people truly interested in reforming this institution, I think there are people on both sides, have to step up and say, "Enough is enough is enough. It is time that the gift ban legislation comes to the floor, and it is definitely time that the lobbying legislation comes to the floor as well."

It is unfortunate that the legislative appropriations bill was pulled. I am hopeful, perhaps naively so, but I am hopeful that we will have enough push from people from both sides of the aisle that, when these measures come up again in the next day or two, that the leadership will finally acknowledge the reality that there is support from a majority of people in this institution to vote on it, and I truly hope that we do get a chance to vote on it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is the gentleman aware that Speaker GINGRICH has kept since July 26 the lobby reform bill that

the gentlewoman wants an announcement for us to wait on? It has been sitting there since July 26 and has not even been referred to a committee for any hearing or any appropriate action.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I was not aware of that until yesterday, and again I think it is something that should move forward.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding this time to me. I just wanted to clarify a point.

I came over to the floor hearing a rather lively, but nongermane, discussion about a gift ban in the context of the, as I understand it, transportation appropriations conference report, and I want to clarify a point that the gentlewoman made earlier. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is one of the more eloquent and dynamic speakers in the House, is thundering along with righteous indignation about the fact that the House has not taken up a gift-ban related legislation to date. She made the point that she is the primary sponsor and author of a gift ban for House Members, and I want to clarify again that the gentleman from Texas is not a cosponsor of the gentlewoman's legislation.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. RIGGS. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the gentlewoman to clarify that point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. That is correct.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman is aware that I was the third person in this House to call for a discharge petition on the gift ban last spring, long before the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] bothered to even initiate any action, but if it is such a good idea, why do we not pass her bill today?

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman, if he feels that strongly, to the point where he has signed a discharge petition, why he is unwilling or unable to cosponsor the gentlewoman's bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. I am not only willing to cosponsor it, I am willing to vote for it today, and that is what I am asking for, a vote on her particular proposal, but what she wants is to delay it—

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, then the gentleman would have no objection then if we were to prepare a form now and add his name as a cosponsor of the gentlewoman's bill. We will just drop it right down here at the slot where it is appropriate to add cosponsors of congressional legislation at any time. If the gentleman would like to write that out, I would be happy to drop it in the slot.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would ask unanimous consent to do it and further ask

unanimous consent to take it up and consider it at this time so we can go on and vote it out of here right now if it is such a great idea.

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, unanimous consent is certainly not necessary for the gentleman to become a cosponsor. All that is necessary for the gentleman to become a cosponsor is for him to simply write something out to that effect, and I would be happy to provide it in the slot down there—

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add my name as a cosponsor to the legislation of the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). In the opinion of the Chair the chief sponsor of the bill is responsible for that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe unanimous consent is not necessary. We welcome the gentleman in support of our legislation.

Mr. DOGGETT. She could do it right now by unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is only the responsibility of the chief sponsor to add names.

#### REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF LOBBY REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. DOGGETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider that bill at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already denied that recognition earlier.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the reason that we are forced to discuss this matter on a nongermane bill is because we are not allowed to discuss this matter when it is germane. The Republicans, I believe three or four times now, have opened up the rules of this House to make minor changes to the rules and the runnings of this House, and yet they have refused even at that time to take up the gift ban. All that is necessary for the gift ban in this House is for the Speaker just to say "no" to the lobbyists and just to say "yes" to letting the bill come up. It affects only the rules of the House, as the gentlewoman has pointed out, and it can be done in a matter of moments, and we can be done with it, and we can then go to the public and show them what we have severed, that relationship with lobbyists and with others who seek on a daily basis to shower the Members of this House with gifts hoping to seek an audience, time, effort, or whatever on behalf of their interests. Many of us have done this in our own offices, but it ought to be the policy of this House, and what is standing in the way is the Speaker and the majority leader who want to keep telling us about the procedure that they want to consider as opposed to the changes in the laws, and therefore, we have to raise this issue on the legislative ap-

propriations bill, or now in the transportation bill, because we cannot get an audience, and we cannot get a hearing, and when we raise it where it might be vulnerable, we see the bill is taken from the schedule because there may be a vote in support of this position, and now we see that when it looks like gift ban is coming to a head, they want to sever it from the lobbying bill. The lobbying bill has been sitting at the desk. We know that another bill can be sent, it can be sent to conference, and our colleagues can finesse this, and the public will never get lobbying reform that they are clamoring for and that they are demanding from this institution.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot go through a legislative dance. Our leadership went through this legislative dance 2 years ago, and we ended up with no results. Our colleagues can go this legislative dance again, and those of us who are interested in lobby reform, gift reform, and election law reform, and even campaign finance reform, we can sit here and watch the dance, and nothing will happen, and the public will be deprived. We are entitled, as Members of this House, to better than that, and the public is entitled to better than that. What they are entitled to is the consideration of this legislation.

I appreciate proxy reform, but it does no good if we do not allow proxy voting and the members who are sitting in the committee are there burping from the dinners that they have had with lobbyists and others as they vote on legislation that is before the committee. It is more important that we take care of the severing of those relationships, that we reform the lobbying practices around here and we get on with campaign finance reform. That is what we ought to do, that is what the public wants us to do, that is what they thought our colleagues were going to do when they voted for them in the last election, but that is not what has happened, and it has not happened because Speaker GINGRICH, majority leader ARMEY, they continue to thwart the path of this legislation and consideration of it to the floor of the House.

We ought to be able to deal with that and deal with it now, and the continued delay, when we have the rules up, it is not the right time; when we have the bill up, it is not the right time; when we have the conference report up, it is not the right time, it is not germane. That is the dance of legislation that has kept us away from these kinds of reforms for the last 20 years.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that the last 20 years have been controlled by the gentleman's party. In the first 8 months we have accomplished extraordinary change in this Congress. We are going to enact a bill this week that will balance the budget over the next 7 years, and then the very next day our majority leader is going to announce when we will take up this legislation.

I think we are making progress, Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], our colleague.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] for yielding this time to me.

This has been such a fascinating discussion, and, as my colleagues know, it would be laughable if some of these people on the other side actually were not taking it seriously.

I mean here is a party that literally controlled the House for 40 years and never did any of these things, and now they are all upset because they have to wait a day or two. I mean it is a joke. These folks, as my colleagues know, for years made certain that none of this kind of thing ever got to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, there has been more reform in the first 9 months of this Congress than we saw in the entire 20 years that I have served here, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] who just spoke, he was here before I got here.

So the fact is that we are seeing a number of reforms, and they are just not coming as fast as some of the other people on the other side would like them to come because they are now in a position, not having much to do, they do not have much in the way of policy that they are pursuing, they are losing issue after issue, and so they have now decided that everything they thought was wrong during the 40 years that was their control, they now try to bring over and put on the heads of the people who now control the body.

I mean this is a joke, my colleagues, and I mean it is even kind of a crummy joke.

Now let us get to the real issue of why they want to bring the legislative appropriations bill out here and debate it. The fact is what they are really against is the fact that the legislative appropriations bill actually cuts spending for the Congress. It is a real reform. We actually for the first time are reversing the trend of ever-increasing congressional budget and are actually reducing the amount of money that comes to the Congress. And guess what? When that went down to the President, the President vetoed that bill.

Now here was a bill that cuts the amount of money going to the Congress substantially, and the President vetoed the bill. Now we have got folks defending the President's position. They want to have some reason to vote against this bill that cuts the Congress, and so the fact is what we are really hearing is from people who do not want to cut legislative spending. For 40 years they had that spending climbing. They had staffs around here that burst the seams of the place. We had office buildings full of staff.

Mr. Speaker, we are now trying to cut the budget, and we are going to actually try and sell off an office building, and guess what? The folks who put

all of that in place want to continue the spending, and so they are looking for every excuse possible to try to stop the legislative appropriations bill from being successfully completed.

So now they have latched on to lobbying reform, or gift ban reform, or whatever it is they can come up with. They come to the floor with packages wrapped like Christmas presents and so on, every gimmick in the world. I am surprised they do not go out on the lawn and hold a hearing in the rain again on the issue because every possible gimmick they come up with to try to explain why they want the status quo, but in reality the reality of what is happening here on the floor today is we have got a bunch of people who do not want to cut congressional spending, they do not want the reforms, they do not want the congressional spending cut, and they will use every excuse.

Now I realize that I am engaging in a nongermane debate here as well, and the only reason why I did it is because the other side has decided they are going to have nongermane debate on the floor, which does raise an interesting question. They claim that what they want to do is something about lobbies and gifts. What makes us think that they will obey the rules that we set up under those provisions any more than they obey the rules of the House by coming out here and having these nongermane discussions? The fact is that they are subject to a point of order, that what they have been discussing is totally beyond the rules of the House, it ought not be discussed out here today, and they are discussing having more rules that they say that they will obey those when they cannot obey even the simplest ones on the House floor.

□ 1230

Interesting subject matter, but it is a joke.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman agree that House rules were broken blatantly in conjunction with both the House Bank and Post Office scandals, and that that was during, of course, the Democratic Party's control of the House of Representatives?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, yes, and they did everything possible to try to prevent us from bringing those matters to the House floor. They did everything they could to try to stop us from looking at that.

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman agree that the ongoing audit by one of the big six accounting firms of congressional finances, of the House of Representatives' books, has indicated many prima facie violations of House rules, and that that audit is an audit of the administration of the House of Representatives by the Democratic Party?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the fact is that what it at least has indicated is that the books they kept were a mess and no responsible auditing firm could even tell us what really went on, because the books are almost undecipherable. They were an absolute scandal in the way they kept the finances of the House, and yes, it does appear that some people took advantage of that scandalous kind of bookkeeping.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get into this. I came over here to talk about the Transportation appropriation bill. However, since I do have some considerable experience with the history of reform in this place, I think I would like to put in some perspective what I have heard here on this issue.

I was appointed by the Speaker in 1975 to chair the House Commission on Administrative Review, which was supposed to do a top-to-bottom reform of the House administrative structures, write a new code of ethics, and produce new rules on outside income. That was probably the most bloody and brutal experience I have ever had in this place. It cost me a lot of friends, because we did some very tough things that a lot of people did not like.

I can recall at the time when John Rhodes, who was then the Republican minority leader, appointed his members of my commission. He had the courtesy to come to me and say "DAVE, this is going to be a tough job for you. Understand, I am appointing Bill Frenzel as the ranking Republican," but he said "Just because you get his vote on these issues does not mean you will get any other Republican vote, because frankly, the political pressures in this place are going to take over, and whatever you are going to pass, you are going to have to pass on your own side of the aisle." That is very much what happened. We brought the administrative reforms to the floor of the House, reforms which, among other things, would have created the first professional administrator in the House. I am convinced we would never have had the banking problem or any of the other problems if we had had a professional administrator at that time.

However, when the votes came, we were clobbered. We had significant defections on my side of the aisle, we had a majority voting for it, a big majority, but we had some losses on my side of the aisle, and we got not a single Republican vote to take up those reforms that we had worked so hard on. Through the years, some of them were later adopted, but they were adopted on a piecemeal basis because we had not been able to get them all done on that day. And in fact a few of them were actually put into the rules of the House this year by the new majority

party. I congratulate them for doing that. It is about 20 years late that they came to that position, but better late than never. I will take help on those issues anywhere I can get it.

However, I simply want to take this time to point out that we will probably hear, just as we did a long time ago on those reforms, we are going to hear a lot of hypocrisy, because there are going to be people who say that they really do want reform on gift ban and on lobby reform, but they are going to find every way procedurally to drag their feet, hoping in the end we never finish the job. That, frankly, is at least partially what I think is going on right now.

I just want to warn Members, Mr. Speaker, that when we were involved in this fight over outside income, for instance, we were importuned by a lot of Members not to proceed because it would be unfair to the Members. And when we tried to put limits on outside income, for instance, I remember one Member of the House coming to me and saying "DAVE, you don't understand. It isn't that my law practice takes anything away from my time. It is just that as I rise in seniority, the lobbies toss more business our way and I get a piece of the action." I said, "Yes, I understand that is the deal. That is why we are trying to change it." And he understood, all of a sudden, that this was not a typographical error that we had in our bill, we were really trying to get something done with some teeth.

I would simply say that there is, in my view, nothing more important that this institution can do to restore public confidence in it than to immediately deal with the issue of lobby reform and gift ban. I have had it up to here with having to see television stories about how Members will go off on these phony seminars, that are really golfing vacations disguised as seminars, run by some interest group that lobbies this place. That should not happen. That should not be allowed. That should be outlawed today, not a week from now, not a month from now, but today.

We tried to do that last year. We passed it in this House. It was bottled up in the other body by the majority leader, and I would say the record on that is clear. I fully agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] when they say that this matter ought to be disposed of now and immediately.

I have been involved in these reform efforts for some 20 years. I know foot dragging when I see it, and I have seen an awful lot of it the last 3 months. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is right on when he describes where that foot dragging is coming from and why it has to change.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in ending, I would say we are on the Transportation bill, and we have no objections to the rule. I do want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his helpful and I think useful review efforts to pass some reforms in this place, and salute him for his efforts. Nobody has been more deeply involved in trying to get the right kinds of things done around here than the gentleman from Wisconsin. I also would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ] this year for her efforts, to wish her well, and to express the hope that in fact we will be able to vote soon on this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts the gentleman from Wisconsin has made on congressional reform in the past. I appreciate the efforts this Congress has made in the last 10 months.

Real progress was made in this new majority, Mr. Speaker. We have already limited the terms of committee chairmen, we have banned proxy voting, so Members of Congress need to attend their committee hearings, rather than simply allow someone else to exercise their authority for them. We cut committee staffs by one-third.

We have had a house audit that has resulted, unfortunately, in the prior books of this House receiving the lowest rating possible from the accounting firm hired to perform that audit. We have changed the committee structure, and we intend to do more change of that committee structure in the future. And, for the first time, we passed the Shays Act, which will apply all of the laws regarding employment to Congress, so Congress will live by the same laws that we impose on everyone else throughout the country.

These are real reforms, Mr. Speaker, that were enacted by this Congress, and I would suggest that those who believe in reform and want to see reform continue to pay attention to what is going to happen by the end of this week as we announce a schedule for moving forward on additional reforms that were not sufficiently supported in the past, but I believe will be passed by this Congress. I welcome and am encouraged by the attention and the interest from the other side of the aisle to join with those of us who have been working on this issue to get these reforms passed in this Congress.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would simply remind my colleagues that we are voting on the Transportation appropriations bill, that this is an important bill that has received support from both sides of the aisle. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill so we can move forward in making some substantial investment in transportation infrastructure in our country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 241, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 20, 1995, on page H10488.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to the bill, H.R. 2002, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we present to the House the conference report to accompany H.R. 2002, the Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

As Members know, the start of the fiscal year began 3 weeks ago, and the time to conclude the remaining appropriation bills wanes with each passing day. The Department of Transportation, like 11 other Government departments, is operating under the strict terms of the continuing resolution. This conference report will provide funding to further the important operation of transportation programs, including air traffic control, Coast Guard operations, and other critical transportation safety programs outside the continuing resolution.

The Transportation bill always requires a delicate balancing act, and this year proved to be no different. The conferees have had to deal with competing demands for very limited funds. The conference agreement represents the very best effort of the conference committee to achieve a balanced and fair bill, and may I say to colleagues on both sides, a bipartisan bill. This bill has been totally and completely bipartisan. We did not make any decisions in the bill based on partisanship, and we hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that we

can continue that for many years to come.

The conference report before the House today totals \$12.5 billion in discretionary budget authority, and \$11.4 billion in new outlays. The conference report is below the subcommittee's allocation for discretionary budget authority, and just at its allocation for outlays. The total budgetary resources provided, including new budget authority, limitation on obligations, and exempt obligations, is \$13.1 billion in budget authority, and \$37.3 billion in outlays.

The agreement represents an increase of \$1.5 billion in budget authority over last year. However, this figure is a bit misleading. If the totals are adjusted to exclude a rescission of \$2.6 billion in contract authority that does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, but was enacted by Congress this year, the conference report actually reduces spending by \$1.1 billion below comparable fiscal year 1995 levels.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to some of the specific provisions of the conference report. First, the conference agreement drops the Senate provision which designates the National Highway System. I have been assured by the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that the conferees are making progress on that piece of legislation, and that States will soon be in receipt of some \$5.4 billion in highway apportionments that are being held pending the enactment of the NHS. It is imperative that the NHS be designated very soon, as the withholding of \$5.4 billion in NHS and interstate maintenance funds threatens hundreds of thousands of construction jobs and the Nation's infrastructure.

After the worst year in aviation safety in decades, the conference agreement provides \$4.7 billion for the operation of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Nation's air traffic control facilities, \$110 million over last year's and slightly above the administration's request; let me say it again, above the administration's request.

□ 1245

In addition, \$1.9 billion is provided for FAA facilities and equipment.

The conference agreement includes \$159.6 million above the President's request for equipment to enhance safety and capacity of the aviation system, restoring funds to the FAA for safety equipment, such as airport surface detection systems, wind shear detection systems, improved weather detection and forecasting systems, and replacement for computers at Aurora, IL, and our other centers.

In addition, the conference agreement also provides procurement and personnel reform for the FAA. These reforms would permit the FAA to operate much more efficiently and are fully supported by and included, in part, and at the request of the administration.

Despite suggestions made, and I was somewhat disappointed to see this, by the National Air Traffic Controllers Union, the conference agreement does not force the disestablishment of any existing management labor agreement or lead to the dissolution of any union currently representing the FAA employees.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear about this and quote from the statement of managers, and I quote: "The conferees do not intend that the personnel management reforms in this bill force the disestablishment of any existing management-labor agreement, or lead to the dissolution of any union currently representing FAA employees."

It is interesting that when the air traffic controllers came by to see us, they raised the issue of the 5 percent pay differential. The House went with the 5 percent pay differential, because we think it is important to support the air traffic controllers. The Senate did not. Yet now we hear not that the air traffic controllers union is grateful that this was done and they appreciate what the committee did. They now come in with something that they never raised with us during a meeting on the day of the conference when they spoke to us; they never even raised the issue. They never even raised the issue.

These provisions, Mr. Speaker, would not become effective until April 1, 1996, allowing for sufficient and adequate review by the appropriate authorizing committee. In the wake of the worst year in aviation safety and with equipment failing on a nearly daily basis, as we heard from the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] when she talked about the Denver Airport situation, FAA personnel procurement reforms are necessary. In fact, people would come and say we need to do something. If you just exempt the FAA from procurement and personnel regulations, we can do some of these things, and safety is so important. So we did this in order to bring about these safety changes, and we did it, I might say in fairness to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], in a bipartisan way.

So I think when you come to the FAA, it is safety, safety, safety.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement, as I said, restores the reduction of \$45 million for the 5 percent paid bonus for air traffic controllers. However, in order to accommodate the \$88.6 million estimated for this program, the conferees were required to hold funding for the airport improvement program to the fiscal year 1995 level of \$1.45 billion. The conference report drops controversial language relating to workers' compensation. The conference report also provides new budget authority and obligation limitations for the Federal Highway Administration totaling almost \$20 billion.

The bill includes \$17.550 billion for the primary Federal-aid highway program, and an additional \$2.3 billion for highway programs exempt from the

limitation. In total, highway spending will increase nearly half a billion dollars over comparable fiscal year 1995 levels, to a level that is only half a billion below the fully authorized level of \$20.4 billion.

The conference report includes no special highway demonstration projects, returning some \$350 million appropriated last year in Federal highway aid to the States. Doing so provides greater equity among the States and allows State Governors and departments of transportation to determine the appropriate expenditure of limited Federal highway assistance. Federal highway demonstration projects have gone the way of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone agrees that this is the right thing to do. Every member in the House and in the Senate will now be treated fairly. It will not matter that you happen to be particularly powerful or famous or on a particular committee or having voted a certain way or having come from a certain region or having known somebody. Everybody now will be treated fairly, and I think that is something on which both the Republican party and the Democratic party can agree.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement provides \$2.053 billion for transit formula grants, the midpoint between the House and Senate proposed levels. Within this amount, \$400 million is available for operating assistance, a reduction of \$310 million from last year's level, and \$100 million below the level requested by the President.

Recognizing the limited ability of smaller and more rural transit providers to respond to reductions in Federal subsidies, the conference agreement provides that operating assistance to urbanized areas under 200,000 not be cut more than 25 percent from last year's level.

A total of \$3.375 billion is provided for the Coast Guard. These funds are supplemented by an additional \$300 million to be transferred to the Coast Guard from the Department of Defense, and I appreciate the DOD appropriations subcommittee doing that, because we would have been very hard pressed had we not had the good cooperation of Chairman YOUNG and also Senator STEVENS on the Senate side. In total, funds for the Coast Guard rise \$108 million over fiscal year 1995 levels.

Program increases, however, came at the expense of other programs, like Amtrak. Federal subsidies for Amtrak are curtailed by 20 percent, falling from \$793 million in fiscal year 1995 to \$635 million in fiscal year 1996. Other program reductions include: essential air service, down \$10.8 million; the northeast corridor improvement program, down \$85 million; transit operating assistance, down \$310 million; transit research and development, down \$6.8 million; pipeline activities, down \$6 million.

In total, the conference report kills 20 programs, including local rail

freight assistance, the interstate transfer grants for transit, the right-of-way revolving fund, numerous Coast Guard and FAA activities, and supportive service of the Federal Highway Administration.

Consistent with the will of Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission is eliminated in fiscal year 1996 and is funded at \$13.8 million only for the first quarter of the fiscal year. An additional \$8.4 million is provided for the successor to the ICC and once enacted into law by an authorization Administrative activities of the Department are also trimmed, including awards and bonuses, an 8 staff in the office of the Secretary and 10 political appointees department-wide. The Department is required to consolidate or colocate its extensive field offices saving \$25 million in this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement prohibits training that is offensive to Federal workers including the HIV-AIDS and diversity training which was so controversial.

Mr. Speaker, additional details of the bill are addressed in the conference re-

port and in a joint statement of the managers. H.R. 2002 is a fair and balanced and bipartisan bill. It represents a compromise between the House and the Senate. It falls within the committee's 602(b) allocation, and has the support of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to Secretary Peña on Friday, and he said that this bill would be signed, that the administrator was in agreement. In fact, all indications, as I said, from the White House as well as the Office of Management and Budget, I assume, are certain that the President will sign the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it does deserve the support, frankly, of all of the Members, and I urge its adoption swiftly.

I want to thank all of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for their help and their cooperation. I also want to pay a tribute to all of the staff members, and identify them individually, for the good and the diligent work that they have done on both sides. It was a new team, a new operation, and they did a good job. I would like to acknowledge the following staff who worked on this bill: from

the Majority Subcommittee staff: John Blazey; Rich Efford; Stephanie Gupta; Linda Muir; Deborah Frazier; and Ken Marx; from the Majority associate staff: Lori-Beth Feld Hua; Glenn LeMunyon; Connie Veillette; Jennifer Miller; Bill Deere; Ray Mock; Sean Murphy; Steve Carey; and Paul Cambon; from the Minority Subcommittee staff: Cheryl Smith; and from the Minority associate staff: Christy Cockburn; Kristen Hoeschler; Jim Jepsen; Barbara Zylinski-Mizrahi; and Paul Carver.

I also want to thank Senator HATFIELD, personally somebody that I have always admired for many years. It was a privilege for me to have the opportunity to work with him. He was a complete gentleman, and we really never had any differences that were really the type that you sometimes think about. So I just want to thank Senator HATFIELD and his staff and the Members of that side for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following information for inclusion in the RECORD:



## H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</b>						
<b>Office of the Secretary</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	58,094,000	57,459,000	55,011,500	56,500,000	56,189,000	-1,905,000
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(1,220,000)					(-1,220,000)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(583,000)					(-583,000)
Office of the General Counsel.....	(7,876,000)					(-7,876,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy.....	(2,309,000)					(-2,309,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.....	(7,887,000)					(-7,887,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(4,400,000)					(-4,400,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,250,000)					(-2,250,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(22,425,000)					(-22,425,000)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(1,380,000)					(-1,380,000)
Executive Secretariat.....	(932,000)					(-932,000)
Contract Appeals Board.....	(630,000)					(-630,000)
Office of Civil Rights.....	(1,779,000)					(-1,779,000)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(936,000)					(-936,000)
Minority Business Resource Center.....	(4,000,000)					(-4,000,000)
Office of Intelligence and Security.....	(800,000)					(-800,000)
Office of Intermodalism.....	(1,000,000)					(-1,000,000)
Undistributed.....	(-2,313,000)					(+2,313,000)
Office of civil rights.....		12,793,000	6,554,000	12,083,000	6,554,000	+6,554,000
Transportation planning, research, and development.....	8,293,000	15,710,000	3,309,000	9,710,000	8,220,000	-73,000
Office of Commercial Space Transportation: Operations and Research.....	6,080,000					-6,080,000
Working capital fund.....	(93,000,000)	(104,364,000)	(102,231,000)	(104,364,000)	(103,149,000)	(+10,149,000)
Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(26,738,539)	(22,800,000)	(-10,823,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(26,738,539)	(22,800,000)	(-10,823,000)
Rescission of contract authority.....	(-4,000,000)	(-38,800,000)	(-23,800,000)	(-11,861,484)	(-16,000,000)	(-12,000,000)
Rescission.....		(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)	(-6,786,971)
Rental payments.....	144,419,000	143,436,000	130,803,000	139,689,000	135,200,000	-9,219,000
Headquarters facilities.....		331,000,000				
Minority business resource center program.....	1,800,000	1,900,000	1,800,000	1,900,000	1,800,000	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	
Minority business outreach.....		2,900,000	2,800,000	2,100,000	2,900,000	+2,900,000
ICC Sunset.....		4,705,000		4,705,000		
State infrastructure loans (sec. 349).....				250,000,000		
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary.....</b>	<b>218,786,000</b>	<b>599,903,000</b>	<b>200,477,500</b>	<b>478,887,000</b>	<b>210,983,000</b>	<b>-7,803,000</b>
(Limitations on obligations).....	(33,423,000)		(15,000,000)	(26,738,539)	(22,800,000)	(-10,823,000)
<b>Total budgetary resources.....</b>	<b>(252,189,000)</b>	<b>(599,903,000)</b>	<b>(215,477,500)</b>	<b>(503,425,539)</b>	<b>(233,563,000)</b>	<b>(-18,626,000)</b>
<b>Coast Guard</b>						
Operating expenses.....	2,596,000,000	2,618,316,000	2,565,807,000	2,286,000,000	2,278,991,000	-319,009,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:						
Vessels.....	187,800,000	203,700,000	191,200,000	178,000,000	167,800,000	-20,300,000
Aircraft.....	11,800,000	19,500,000	16,500,000	14,500,000	12,000,000	+200,000
Other equipment.....	29,700,000	56,300,000	42,200,000	47,600,000	49,200,000	+19,500,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation.....	89,350,000	99,800,000	82,275,000	80,200,000	88,875,000	-475,000
Personnel and related support.....	44,200,000	48,900,000	43,000,000	46,500,000	44,700,000	+500,000
<b>Subtotal, A C &amp; I.....</b>	<b>362,850,000</b>	<b>428,200,000</b>	<b>375,175,000</b>	<b>366,800,000</b>	<b>362,375,000</b>	<b>-575,000</b>
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	23,500,000	25,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-2,500,000
Port Safety Development.....				15,000,000	15,000,000	+15,000,000
Alteration of bridges.....		2,000,000	16,000,000	2,000,000	16,000,000	+16,000,000
Retired pay.....	562,585,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	562,022,000	+19,437,000
Reserve training.....	64,861,000	64,859,000	61,859,000	62,000,000	62,000,000	-2,981,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	20,310,000	22,500,000	18,500,000	20,000,000	18,000,000	-2,310,000
Boat safety (Aquatic Resources Trust Fund).....	25,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	-5,000,000
Emergency Fund (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (limitation of permanent appropriation).....			(3,000,000)			
<b>Total, Coast Guard.....</b>	<b>3,657,326,000</b>	<b>3,742,897,000</b>	<b>3,980,163,000</b>	<b>3,354,822,000</b>	<b>3,375,388,000</b>	<b>-281,938,000</b>
<b>Federal Aviation Administration</b>						
Operations.....	4,595,394,000	4,704,000,000	4,800,000,000	4,550,000,000	4,845,712,000	+50,318,000
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	2,087,489,000	1,917,847,000	2,000,000,000	1,880,377,000	1,834,883,000	-152,606,000
Rescission.....	(-35,000,000)		(-80,000,000)	(-70,000,000)	(-60,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	259,192,000	267,961,000	143,000,000	215,886,000	185,896,000	-73,494,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	
(Limitation on obligations).....	(1,450,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,800,000,000)	(1,250,000,000)	(1,450,000,000)	
Rescission of contract authority.....				-5,000,000		
Rescission of contract authority (sec. 349 j).....				-250,000,000		

## H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Aircraft purchase loan guarantee program..... (Limitation on borrowing authority).....	148,000 (9,970,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	50,000 (1,800,000)	-98,000 (-8,370,000)
Total, Federal Aviation Administration..... (Limitations on obligations).....	6,942,223,000 (1,480,000,000)	6,889,558,000 (1,500,000,000)	6,743,050,000 (1,800,000,000)	6,868,313,000 (1,280,000,000)	6,788,343,000 (1,480,000,000)	-175,880,000
Total budgetary resources.....	(6,382,223,000)	(6,389,558,000)	(6,343,050,000)	(7,908,313,000)	(6,216,343,000)	(-175,880,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations).....		(-1,500,000,000)				
Total budgetary resources.....	(6,382,223,000)	(6,889,558,000)	(6,343,050,000)	(7,908,313,000)	(6,216,343,000)	(-175,880,000)
Federal Highway Administration						
Limitation on general operating expenses.....	(525,341,000)	(688,488,000)	(495,381,000)	(548,434,000)	(509,880,000)	(-15,881,000)
Highway-related safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+200,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+200,000)
Rescission of contract authority.....	(-20,000,000)					(+20,000,000)
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund): (Limitation on obligations).....	(17,180,000,000)	(20,254,255,000)	(18,000,000,000)	(17,000,000,000)	(17,550,000,000)	(+380,000,000)
(Exempt obligations).....	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,832,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,808,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(17,000,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(18,200,000,000)	(18,200,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(+2,200,000,000)
Right-of-way revolving fund (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on direct loans).....	(42,500,000)					(-42,500,000)
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(73,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(74,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(78,150,000)	(75,000,000)	(77,225,000)	(+3,225,000)
Surface transportation projects.....	352,055,000			39,500,000		-352,055,000
Rescission.....	(-12,004,000)					(+12,004,000)
High priority corridor (sec. 314A).....	6,000,000					-6,000,000
Orange County, CA toll road project (sec. 336a).....	8,000,000					-8,000,000
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	368,055,000			39,500,000		-368,055,000
(Limitations on obligations).....	(17,244,800,000)	(20,349,255,000)	(18,088,150,000)	(17,088,000,000)	(17,838,225,000)	(+393,425,000)
(Exempt obligations).....	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,832,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,808,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(19,878,558,000)	(20,429,255,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(19,489,007,000)	(19,989,732,000)	(+91,178,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations).....		(-20,134,255,000)				
Total budgetary resources.....	(19,878,558,000)	(205,000,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(19,489,007,000)	(19,989,732,000)	(+91,178,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
Operations and research.....	79,558,000	84,588,000	73,318,570	71,281,000	73,318,570	-8,239,430
Rescissions.....			(-4,547,185)			
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund).....	48,997,000	59,744,000	52,011,930	50,344,000	51,884,430	+4,887,430
Subtotal, Operations and research.....	128,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	121,605,000	125,201,000	-1,352,000
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(151,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(155,100,000)	(155,100,000)	(+4,100,000)
State and community highway safety grants (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations).....	(123,000,000)	(188,800,000)	(128,000,000)	(128,000,000)	(127,700,000)	(+4,700,000)
National Driver Register (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations).....	(3,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,100,000)	(2,400,000)	(-1,000,000)
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs (Sec. 410) (limitation on obligations).....	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.....	128,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	121,605,000	125,201,000	-1,352,000
(Limitations on obligations).....	(151,400,000)	(188,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(155,100,000)	(155,100,000)	(+3,700,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(277,953,000)	(340,342,000)	(278,728,500)	(276,705,000)	(280,301,000)	(+2,348,000)
Federal Railroad Administration						
Office of the Administrator.....	13,080,000	17,370,000	14,000,000	14,018,000	14,018,000	+828,000
(By transfer).....	(811,850)					(-811,850)
Local rail freight assistance.....	17,000,000					-17,000,000
Rescission.....	(-8,583,000)					(+8,583,000)
Railroad safety.....	47,729,000	51,104,000	49,840,880	49,105,000	49,919,000	+2,180,000
Railroad research and development.....	20,500,000	48,947,000	21,000,000	25,775,000	24,550,000	+4,080,000
Northeast corridor improvement program.....	200,000,000	235,000,000	100,000,000	130,000,000	115,000,000	-85,000,000
Next generation high speed rail.....	20,000,000	30,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000	19,205,000	-795,000
Trust fund share of next generation high speed rail (Highway Trust Fund): (Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,400,000)	(7,118,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(7,118,000)	(+3,718,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation.....				10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
Pennsylvania station redevelopment project.....	40,000,000	50,000,000		25,000,000		-40,000,000
Rescission.....	(-40,000,000)					(+40,000,000)
Rhode Island Rail Development.....	5,000,000	10,000,000		2,000,000	1,000,000	-4,000,000

## H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation:</b>						
Operations .....	542,000,000	420,000,000	336,000,000	305,000,000	305,000,000	-237,000,000
Transition costs .....			62,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	+ 100,000,000
Capital .....	251,500,000	230,000,000	230,000,000	200,000,000	230,000,000	-21,500,000
Long-term restructuring transition .....		100,000,000				
<b>Total, Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corp.....</b>	<b>793,500,000</b>	<b>750,000,000</b>	<b>628,000,000</b>	<b>605,000,000</b>	<b>635,000,000</b>	<b>-158,500,000</b>
<b>Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....</b>	<b>1,156,819,000</b>	<b>1,182,421,000</b>	<b>822,840,880</b>	<b>885,888,000</b>	<b>888,882,000</b>	<b>-288,127,000</b>
(Limitations on obligations) .....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	
<b>Total budgetary resources .....</b>	<b>(1,181,819,000)</b>	<b>(1,187,421,000)</b>	<b>(827,840,880)</b>	<b>(885,888,000)</b>	<b>(873,882,000)</b>	<b>(-288,127,000)</b>
<b>Unified transportation infrastructure invest program .....</b>						
<b>Total budgetary resources .....</b>	<b>(1,181,819,000)</b>	<b>(1,182,421,000)</b>	<b>(827,840,880)</b>	<b>(885,888,000)</b>	<b>(873,882,000)</b>	<b>(-288,127,000)</b>
<b>Federal Transit Administration</b>						
Administrative expenses .....	43,080,000	44,202,000	39,280,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	-1,080,000
Formula grants .....	840,000,000	1,244,200,000	490,000,000	585,000,000	542,925,000	-97,075,000
Operating assistance grants .....	710,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	-310,000,000
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations) .....	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,110,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,110,000,000)	(-40,000,000)
University transportation centers .....	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	
Transit planning and research .....	92,250,000	100,027,000	82,250,000	80,000,000	85,500,000	-6,750,000
Metropolitan planning program .....		(41,512,500)	(38,438,250)	(40,500,000)	(39,500,000)	(+ 39,500,000)
Rural transit assistance program .....		(4,812,500)	(4,281,250)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(+ 4,500,000)
Transit cooperative research program .....		(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)	(+ 8,250,000)
National TPR program .....		(33,982,000)	(19,480,000)	(25,500,000)	(22,000,000)	(+ 22,000,000)
State TPR program .....		(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(8,250,000)	(8,250,000)	(+ 8,250,000)
National transit institute .....		(3,000,000)	(2,850,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(+ 3,000,000)
<b>Subtotal, Transit planning and research.....</b>	<b>(92,250,000)</b>	<b>(100,027,000)</b>	<b>(82,250,000)</b>	<b>(80,000,000)</b>	<b>(85,500,000)</b>	<b>(-6,750,000)</b>
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization) .....	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(-29,150,000)
Discretionary grants .....		59,944,000				
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations):						
Fixed guideway modernization .....	(725,000,000)	(724,978,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(-69,000,000)
Bus and bus-related facilities .....	(353,330,000)	(274,982,000)	(333,000,000)	(333,000,000)	(333,000,000)	(-20,330,000)
New starts .....	(646,670,000)	(724,978,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(686,000,000)	(+ 19,330,000)
<b>Subtotal, Discretionary grants.....</b>	<b>(1,725,000,000)</b>	<b>(1,724,944,000)</b>	<b>(1,685,000,000)</b>	<b>(1,685,000,000)</b>	<b>(1,685,000,000)</b>	<b>(-60,000,000)</b>
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization) .....	(1,500,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(+ 500,000,000)
Interstate transfer grants - transit .....	48,030,000					-48,030,000
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority .....	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	170,000,000	200,000,000	
Violent crime reduction program (Violent Crime Trust Fund) .....		5,000,000				
<b>Total, Federal Transit Administration .....</b>	<b>1,739,340,000</b>	<b>2,159,373,000</b>	<b>1,217,510,000</b>	<b>1,283,000,000</b>	<b>1,278,425,000</b>	<b>-482,915,000</b>
(Limitations on obligations) .....	(2,875,000,000)	(2,845,784,000)	(2,775,000,000)	(2,785,850,000)	(2,775,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
<b>Total budgetary resources .....</b>	<b>(4,814,340,000)</b>	<b>(5,006,187,000)</b>	<b>(3,982,510,000)</b>	<b>(4,078,850,000)</b>	<b>(4,051,425,000)</b>	<b>(-582,915,000)</b>
<b>Unified transportation infrastructure invest program .....</b>						
(Limitation on obligations) .....		(-2,184,373,000)				
<b>Total budgetary resources .....</b>	<b>(4,814,340,000)</b>	<b>(84,944,000)</b>	<b>(3,982,510,000)</b>	<b>(4,078,850,000)</b>	<b>(4,051,425,000)</b>	<b>(-582,915,000)</b>
<b>Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation</b>						
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund) .....	10,251,000	10,243,000	10,190,500	10,150,000	10,150,000	-101,000
<b>Research and Special Programs Administration</b>						
Research and special programs .....	28,238,000	31,882,000	28,030,000	24,281,000	23,937,000	-2,301,000
Hazardous materials safety .....	(12,887,000)	(12,782,000)	(12,800,000)	(12,987,000)	(12,850,000)	(-247,000)
Aviation information management .....	(2,453,000)	(2,282,000)	(2,322,000)			(-2,453,000)
Emergency transportation .....	(1,328,000)	(1,301,000)	(1,088,000)	(982,000)	(1,022,000)	(-304,000)
Research and technology .....	(2,530,000)	(7,804,000)	(3,208,000)	(3,451,000)	(3,288,000)	(+ 758,000)
Program and administrative support .....	(7,032,000)	(7,883,000)	(7,384,000)	(7,282,000)	(7,388,000)	(+ 366,000)
Accountwide adjustment .....			(-581,000)	(-411,000)	(-411,000)	(-411,000)
<b>Subtotal, research and special programs.....</b>	<b>(26,238,000)</b>	<b>(31,882,000)</b>	<b>(26,030,000)</b>	<b>(24,281,000)</b>	<b>(23,937,000)</b>	<b>(-2,301,000)</b>
Pipeline safety (Pipeline Safety Fund) .....	34,991,500	39,720,000	27,243,000	30,275,000	28,750,000	-6,241,500
Pipeline safety (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) .....	2,432,500	2,898,000	2,898,000	2,898,000	2,898,000	+ 285,500
<b>Subtotal, Pipeline safety.....</b>	<b>37,424,000</b>	<b>42,618,000</b>	<b>29,941,000</b>	<b>32,973,000</b>	<b>31,448,000</b>	<b>-5,978,000</b>

## H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Alaska Pipeline task Force (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (rescission) .....	(-544,000)					(+544,000)
Emergency preparedness grants: (Emergency preparedness fund) .....	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	
(Limitation on obligations) .....	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,880,000)	(9,200,000)	(8,880,000)	(-1,910,000)
Total, Research and Special Programs Administration .....	64,082,000	74,480,000	58,371,000	57,854,000	55,785,000	-8,277,000
(Limitations on obligations) .....	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,880,000)	(9,200,000)	(8,880,000)	(-1,910,000)
Total budgetary resources .....	(74,882,000)	(85,818,000)	(65,281,000)	(68,854,000)	(64,875,000)	(-10,187,000)
Office of Inspector General						
Salaries and expenses .....	40,000,000	40,238,000	40,238,000	39,881,200	40,238,000	+238,000
Bureau of Transportation Statistics						
Salaries and expenses .....				2,200,000	2,200,000	+2,200,000
General Provisions						
Administrative provision: Procurement (sec. 323a) .....	-65,120,000					+65,120,000
Bureau of Transportation Statistics (transfer from Federal-aid Highways) .....	(15,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
Federal railroad transfer (sec. 341) .....	3,000,000					-3,000,000
Federal-aid highways (sec. 310 (e)) .....		-574,341,000				
Working capital fund reduction (sec. 327) .....	-7,000,000		-10,000,000	-5,000,000	-7,500,000	-500,000
DOT field office consolidation (sec. 335) .....			-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000
ICC transition (sec. 344) .....			8,421,000		8,421,000	+8,421,000
Total, title I, Department of Transportation (net) .....	14,134,164,000	14,203,727,029	12,754,756,004	12,559,071,785	12,824,519,029	-1,508,844,971
Appropriations .....	(14,252,275,000)	(14,249,114,000)	(12,848,880,180)	(12,902,720,200)	(12,707,308,000)	(-1,544,989,000)
Rescissions .....	(-118,111,000)	(-45,388,971)	(-84,834,158)	(-343,848,435)	(-62,788,971)	(+36,324,029)
(Limitations on obligations) .....	(21,770,423,000)	(24,907,387,000)	(22,848,440,000)	(21,318,888,538)	(22,054,815,000)	(+284,382,000)
(Exempt obligations) .....	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)
Total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations) .....	(38,172,288,000)	(39,181,114,029)	(37,713,126,004)	(38,210,467,301)	(37,010,841,029)	(-1,181,448,971)
Adjustments made for unified program .....		-3,189,373,000				
(Limitation on obligations) .....		(-24,420,105,000)				
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program .....		24,382,976,000				
Total budgetary resources .....	(38,172,288,000)	(39,183,985,029)	(37,713,126,004)	(38,210,467,301)	(37,010,841,029)	(-1,181,448,971)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board						
Salaries and expenses .....	3,350,000	3,656,000	3,656,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	+150,000
National Transportation Safety Board						
Salaries and expenses .....	37,382,000	38,774,000	38,774,000	37,500,000	38,774,000	+1,382,000
Emergency fund .....		380,802	180,802	380,802	380,802	+380,802
Total, National Transportation Safety Board .....	37,382,000	39,134,802	38,934,802	37,880,802	39,134,802	+1,742,802
Interstate Commerce Commission						
Salaries and expenses .....	30,302,000	28,844,000	13,379,000	13,379,000	13,379,000	-16,923,000
Payments for directed rail service (limitation on obligations) .....	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission .....	(30,777,000)	(29,319,000)	(13,854,000)	(13,854,000)	(13,854,000)	(-16,923,000)
Panama Canal Commission						
Panama Canal Revolving Fund:						
(Administrative expenses) .....	(50,030,000)	(50,741,980)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(+711,000)
(Limitation on operating and capital expenses) .....	(540,000,000)					(-540,000,000)
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority						
Interest payments and repayments of principal .....	9,183,000					-9,183,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies .....	80,237,000	71,834,802	55,989,802	54,739,802	56,013,802	-24,223,198
(Limitation on obligations) .....	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	
Total budgetary resources .....	(80,712,000)	(72,109,802)	(56,444,802)	(55,214,802)	(56,488,802)	(-24,223,198)

## H.R. 2002 - Transportation and Related Agencies, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Total appropriations in this bill (net) .....	14,214,401,000	35,488,984,831	12,810,725,808	12,813,811,587	12,880,532,831	-1,533,888,189
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-2,871,053,000	375,011,000	370,883,000	387,511,148	383,878,148	+3,064,728,148
<b>Grand total (net) .....</b>	<b>11,543,348,000</b>	<b>35,843,975,831</b>	<b>13,181,708,808</b>	<b>12,981,322,715</b>	<b>13,084,208,979</b>	<b>+1,520,880,979</b>
Appropriations.....	(11,881,458,000)	(35,888,382,802)	(13,278,842,882)	(13,324,971,150)	(13,146,895,950)	(+1,485,536,950)
Recessions.....	(-118,111,000)	(-45,388,971)	(-84,894,188)	(-343,848,435)	(-82,788,871)	(+35,324,029)
(Limitations on obligations).....	(21,770,888,000)	(487,757,000)	(22,848,918,000)	(21,320,383,538)	(22,085,280,000)	(+284,382,000)
(Exempt obligations) .....	(2,287,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,832,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,808,000)
<b>Grand total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations).....</b>	<b>(35,881,947,000)</b>	<b>(36,411,732,831)</b>	<b>(38,140,555,808)</b>	<b>(36,833,183,251)</b>	<b>(37,451,005,979)</b>	<b>(+1,889,058,979)</b>
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>						
Total mandatory and discretionary .....	11,543,348,000	35,843,975,831	13,181,708,808	12,981,322,715	13,084,208,979	+1,520,880,979
Mandatory .....	571,828,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	582,072,000	+10,148,000
Discretionary:						
Crime trust fund.....		5,000,000				
General purposes.....	10,971,422,000	35,256,903,831	12,599,636,808	12,399,250,715	12,482,136,979	+1,510,714,979
<b>Total, Discretionary.....</b>	<b>10,971,422,000</b>	<b>35,261,903,831</b>	<b>12,599,636,808</b>	<b>12,399,250,715</b>	<b>12,482,136,979</b>	<b>+1,510,714,979</b>

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with Chairman WOLF, the gentleman from Virginia, in supporting the conference report on H.R. 2002, the fiscal year 1996 Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill. The conferees faced a tremendous challenge, Mr. Speaker, in determining how to make critical investments in our Nation's transportation infrastructure under what were very tight budget constraints given us as a result of the actions of this Congress on the budget in our 602(b) allocations.

We were \$100 million in budget authority and \$193 million in outlays below the original House 602(b) target for the bill. Accordingly, we did not do what many of us on our side of the aisle believed we should have done in many, many areas. Nonetheless, I believe that this bill has the support of the administration and that the President will indeed sign it.

Mr. Speaker, the statement of managers I think amply documents the final product of the conferees on the transportation bill as was alluded to by Chairman WOLF.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would only make a few statements with respect to the issue of reorganization within the FAA. I understand that this was a critical issue, a matter of high priority not just of the Republican majority, but indeed Secretary Peña came forward very early on, prior indeed to this Congress even convening, telling us how it was that the administration intended to do the kinds of cuts, to make the kinds of streamlining that he felt the Department of Transportation should engage in in order to more effectively serve the American people.

I would say in that regard, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress, in taking up overall the issue of having the FAA administrator, we require him in this legislation to develop new personnel and acquisition systems for the FAA. I am one, and I think I can speak for most of the Democrats on our side in saying that we support freeing the FAA from many problems that may indeed be undermining its ability to modernize the air traffic control system; and we want to be sure, as does the chairman, that we respond efficiently to the needs of the aviation industry and all airline passengers.

Air traffic control system failures in Chicago, New York, Leesburg, Oakland and, just recently, Dallas highlight all too dramatically that the FAA's problems are real and do need immediate attention.

The personnel reform section of this legislation, I want to correct only one statement made by the chairman and that was certainly a lot of us were raising the issue about where we were

going to be with respect to air traffic controllers and FAA employees some weeks prior to the conference, so the chairman may recall that I had raised that issue with him. The conference agreement does charge the FAA Administrator with developing a new personnel system which would give the FAA greater flexibility in hiring and firing, determining promotions and pay, training and location of employees.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I opposed in conference the committee majority decision to allow the FAA administrator to waive current law pertaining to labor management and employee relations' issues.

□ 1300

I think this is exactly the wrong time to be doing that. When we discuss the issue of being able to have a reorganization to put into jeopardy or to cause fear among employees about whether or not they will continue to have the ability to be represented by their current union management contract, whether or not we are going to rewrite labor law in this reorganization or not, I think is bad policy, particularly in an appropriation bill.

We all know that we have authorizing committees in the House and the Senate to take testimony, to deal with issues such as these. My preference all along was that we not do that in this legislation.

I think the right thing to do is to let those committees properly address the matter through a much more deliberative process than our appropriations could have given it had we even done so. We really did not take into account various and sundry, oftentimes very complicated, labor relations issues in any hearings. We just did not do that.

I believe that in the transportation appropriations bill, with the personnel reform provisions not becoming effective until April 1, 1996, I am very hopeful that that will give time to the appropriate authorizing committees in the House and the Senate, ultimately a conference, and hopefully ultimately signing into law, moving to correct what I consider to be a problem in this bill. It is simply we did not waive that as one of the things we could have waived, and that is the reason I offered that amendment which failed, so that we could waive that and not do this in an appropriations bill.

With that having been said, I will come back to some of the issues a bit later.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, admittedly at this time last year when we became the majority, or thereabouts when I knew that

we were going to be in the majority, the first thing I asked for was a position to serve on this subcommittee. The reason I wanted to serve on this subcommittee is because historically it has been an opportunity to pick and choose, like from a Christmas tree, special projects for my own home district.

I knew as soon as BOB LIVINGSTON told me that he had assigned me to this subcommittee that it was going to be clear sailing for SONNY CALLAHAN because my highway projects, my demonstration projects, my airport projects, and everything, just like it has been for the last 20 years, were going to be in that bill because I was sitting at the table bargaining.

How surprised I was at the first meeting when the chairman called us together and said there are going to be no demonstration projects. I smiled somewhat, saying, yes, I know. But we still are going to get them, is what I thought in the back of my mind.

But let me compliment the chairman. He stood his ground against some of the most powerful, some of the most persuasive people in the House and the Senate, and he did not budge one inch. This is responsible government.

No, I did not get the special 14 projects that I wanted to get. We will get them sooner or later, but we will do it the responsible way, by giving the money to the rightful committee or the rightful agency under our jurisdiction, and we will do it in competition with a fair competition with all States. But we are doing this because of one man and certainly with the cooperation of the minority.

I do not want to take anything away from them, because I did not hear that much argument to his philosophy. But for the first time in at least 20 years we have a responsible transportation bill that no one can come back next month and say, "Look what you did. You gave these special projects without any meaningful purpose all of this money simply because of political pressure and compromising, trying to get a transportation appropriation bill through this House."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman, and this country owes him a great debt of gratitude for the responsible way in which he has handled this bill.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member on the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I simply want to make a few short remarks about it before we vote.

I think the agreement reached by the conferees is, for the most part, a fair agreement that respects the priorities of the House and recognizes the conflicting pressures on us as we try to work in a very difficult budget situation.

I am especially pleased, on a personal note, that my State has continued the

progress which it has made the past few years in receiving a fair share of Federal highway funds. I appreciate the fact that this committee has been helpful in seeing to it that we do not make or that we do not experience any significant backsliding in that respect.

I would note that there is not as much in this bill as we would like to have for highways or for airport investments, but given the fact that the 602(b) allocation, which is set by the Chair of the committee, provided less funding for that than we would have liked, the committee had no choice but to produce a bill within those limitations, and I think it has done a fairly reasonable job under those circumstances.

I would note that there is a significant reduction in transit operating subsidies for communities around the country. Communities are not going to like that. I know some communities in my own district are going to be uncomfortable about it. I wish it could have been otherwise. But the fact is if the public is asking for budget cuts, they have to expect that they are going to get budget cuts, and this is one of the places where those cuts are going to bite.

I hope that we can make some adjustments in the future, but, frankly, it is probably going to be tougher next year than it was this year.

I would make just one observation with respect to the personnel reforms at the Federal Aviation Administration that have been mentioned by both the subcommittee chairman and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking member. I think all of us wanted to give the FAA additional ability to reorganize its shop, but I want to say that I think that a number of us have concerns about the lack of protections which we feel are in this bill for workers' rights during that reorganization process. The bill, in our view, does not preserve existing statutory requirements pertaining to labor-management and employee relations' issues, and that concerns us very much.

I would simply say to the FAA that, in exercising the prerogatives which they will have under this legislation, I would urge the agency to proceed with utmost caution; and I would urge them to recognize basic elements of fairness as they deal with their employees. Because, if they do not, I think this Congress will and should in short order be right on their tail; and I think the FAA will wish that they had behaved in a sensitive manner.

I would hope that, given the authority which they have been given by this committee, which I think is too broad, I would hope that they would exercise that authority with great discretion. We will be watching.

Let me also say that I will hope the authorizers would take note of the lack of clarity in this bill on that issue, and I would hope that the authorizers would see to it in legislation that they develop that the agency does, in fact,

meet decent standards of decency in dealing with the employees of that agency. I think Congress has a right to expect that and so do the workers at that agency.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of the committee.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

I would, first of all, like to commend the fine work of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]; the chairman, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking minority member, in putting this package together. I think they have done an excellent job of developing and guiding this important funding bill through the entire process.

I believe this is a conference report that we all can support. The House and Senate conferees have developed a transportation funding bill which funds our Nation's urgent infrastructure needs while meeting the tough first-year targets of our drive to balance the Federal budget.

The aviation funding levels in this bill will allow us to move forward with high-priority safety projects such as the new air traffic control system which will finally take us out of the vacuum tube era.

By rejecting a Senate proposal for new aviation taxes, we have taken the first important step toward rejecting the administration's misguided claim of a pending aviation funding shortage. Frankly, a close examination of future aviation funding needs does not automatically suggest a need for more aviation taxes, and the conferees recognized that fact. In fact, with the personnel and procurement reform in the bill, we may find that we have more than adequate money within the FAA.

The personnel procurement reforms we have put in place will save taxpayers' money, at the same time accelerate the modernization of the FAA and drag them out of the 1950s into the 1990s.

Contrary to what some might say, an FAA personnel reform plan will not disband the unions. In fact, with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] as chairman of this committee and his strong support for Federal employees, that is a great stretch of the imagination in the first place. But what it will do is give the administrator the flexibility that the administration requested and needs to make FAA run in a more efficient way.

We have also included language in the statement of managers recommending the FAA establish a high-level industry working group to assist in developing the FAA's personnel and procurement reform plans. This is the first step toward a permanent FAA management advisory committee.

These FAA reform provisions are a start. I am pleased to say the cause of

FAA reform will move further tomorrow when my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, will hold a markup of the Duncan-Lightfoot independent FAA bill.

Again, in closing, let me commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] as well as the subcommittee's fine staff: John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, Lori-Beth Hua, Debra Frazier and Linda Muir. Without their help, we could not get any of this done. They have done a very fine job.

I urge the adoption of this report.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of engaging the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee in a brief colloquy regarding a critical bay area transportation project. The Tasman Corridor light rail project is an integral piece of the local rail agreement fashioned by our regional metropolitan planning organization, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. All of the bay area jurisdictions are a party to this agreement which represents the best in local planning and decisionmaking. When the California Supreme Court on September 28 invalidated the so-called Measure A, a half-cent sales tax dedicated to many important highway, commuter rail, and transit construction projects in Santa Clara County, the planned-for local match for the Tasman project was assumed to be lost. Due to the perseverance of all involved, in the few short weeks since the ruling, the Tasman Corridor plan has been revised to reflect the new fiscal realities. It has been proposed that only the west extension to Mountain View be built at this time. This segment is compelling. The 7.5-mile line is expected to cost \$125 million less than the original project, with 50 percent of its funding derived from Federal Sec. 3 New Start funds. Of the \$122 million in proposed new starts funding, some \$33 million has already been appropriated and dedicated to the Tasman project by the MTC. The remainder of the funding will come from identified State, local and ISTEA flexible funding sources. This revised plan has the unanimous backing of the transit agency board, and I expect shortly will be approved by the MTC and later included in the California Transportation Commission's revised States Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of these positive developments, and in deference to the local and regional planning process which has served us well, I would ask if the chairman agrees that if the revised Tasman project secures all requisite Federal,



State, and regional approvals in a timely fashion, the \$33 million in unobligated balances referenced in the conference report may be provided by the MTC for the commencement of construction on the Tasman West extension.

□ 1315

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. ESHOO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yes, that is my understanding.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for his understanding. I am very grateful for his thoughtful response.

I would also like to acknowledge the gentleman's staff that has worked with us on this. I look forward to working with the gentleman in making certain that the plan for the Tasman West extension is financially sound, that it is accountable, that it is responsible and that it continues to enjoy the important broad-based support it has had in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] who would like to make some comments on this.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Ms. ESHOO] for taking the lead in this colloquy as well as my other Bay Area colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together in support of the Tasman light-rail project.

I particularly would like to thank the chairman for reaffirming his commitment to local transit agencies and their authority over transit funding decisions.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of the committee.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1996 transportation funding conference bill. Chairman FRANK WOLF deserves high praise for his hard work and diligence in structuring funding for our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

This bill continues Congress' investment in the Nation's infrastructure, providing \$12.5 billion in discretionary budget authority for highways, transit systems, airports, and the Coast Guard. Also included in this bill, is a provision I wholeheartedly support. It denies funding for HIV/AIDS awareness training unless it specifically relates to the workplace rights of HIV-positive employees or to the medical ramifications of HIV/AIDS.

In tight fiscal times such as these, Congress must evaluate all Federal spending and determine where we can get the most bang for the buck. We took a long hard look at the merits of every program in our bill.

For example, the conference agreement includes no special highway demonstration projects, returning some

\$350 million in Federal highway aid to the States. Doing so provides greater equity among the States and allows State Governors and departments of transportation to determine the appropriate expenditure of limited Federal highway assistance.

This bill builds America. We provide a network of transportation that moves America—its people, its products, its services—across town or across the Nation. This bill provides necessary funding to make our citizens mobile and allow our goods and services to get to market. It creates jobs, builds our Nation's infrastructure and ensures the safety of our traveling public.

This is a good, solid bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], and all the members of the conference committee for holding fast in the face of strong opposition from the other body on section 501 of the House version of the transportation appropriations conference report.

This section, an amendment originally offered by myself and by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], provides that no funds appropriated in this bill may be used to tear down and move a few hundred feet at a cost of \$300 million a highway we just finished rebuilding in place for \$90 million.

The only purpose of this proposed boondoggle was to support a proposed luxury housing project being developed and to make the views of this housing project being developed in my district by Donald Trump and his business associates. This measure was supported unanimously by sides of the aisle and shows how this body can come together on issues to benefit the American taxpayer. Again, I want to thank the leaders of the conference committee for their support in this matter.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would only attempt to, if I could, since I do not have any other requests for time of any Members that are here to simply add, if I might, in closing, my appreciation for the fine work and hard effort of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chairman, and the staff that they assembled, Mr. Speaker. All of us know that we cannot do these jobs without the hard work of a lot of very dedicated and fine men and women who help us put together these numbers so that they work, but also they negotiate many times for us with the agencies so we can understand

some of the problems some of the cuts might cause.

In addition, they are able to carry forward some of the arguments that we as Members literally in the committees and in conference do not always get to hear. I particularly want to thank and commend the persons who work hard on the staff.

In addition, if I might, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be wrong for any of us as Members standing here today to talk about a transportation bill that has been nearly a year in the making to not also signal our appreciation to certainly our colleagues on the committee. I know a number have spoken from the other side. I only wanted to highlight the fact that I have been on my side of the aisle blessed with having wonderful cooperation, a lot of history, by the way, from Members who are actually more senior than I on this particular subcommittee.

I wanted to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and certainly one of the more important Members because of his status as the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and one of our newer Members but a Member who understands mass transit in its very intricate forms, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], and all of their staffs for their advice and counsel as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], who wanted to discuss some of the issues pertinent to the Coast Guard.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

I wanted to indicate support for the conference on two fronts. One is with regard to the office of pipeline safety.

I think some of the Members know that almost 2 years ago now in my congressional district in New Jersey we had an explosion, a natural gas pipeline explosion in the area known as Durham Woods. As a consequence of that, I realized how significant funding levels for pipeline safety were, not only in terms of what has to be done in terms of investigation but, even more important, in terms of prevention.

The amount of money that is provided in this conference bill for pipeline safety is better, significantly better than what I thought might result. I am very pleased with that because I know it will allow us to continue to do the kind of work that needs to be done to prevent accidents as the one that occurred in Edison, in my district.

I also wanted to congratulate the conferees and the bill on the fact that, with regard to the small boat Coast Guard stations, there is language that would prohibit their closures. Those of us who fought very hard on the House floor, who felt that the small boat plan that the Coast Guard had put forward was not going to save a significant

amount of money and would actually cost lives appreciate the fact that there is language in this bill now that would prohibit those small boat station closures.

It was not something that was going to save money. So I think that it is consistent with the effort on the part of the committee to try to reduce expenditures, but allowing those stations to close would not have accomplished that fact. So I want to congratulate, thank again the gentleman from Texas as well as the chairman of the subcommittee for their efforts in the conference and urge support for the conference bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, in closing, if I might, Mr. Speaker, I have only one other speaker who may or may not be able to be here because of a conflict in meetings. So in any event, if I could, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], my friend, earlier referred to the fact that the chairman stood strong against any particular highway demo projects.

One of our colleagues in the conference from another State, however, did correctly point out that he was from a State that was not as populous as Virginia or Texas or California and that indeed sometimes it is necessary to provide the highway funding instead of doing airport improvement projects or instead of doing bus or transit new starts. Therefore, he felt it was perfectly legitimate that we indeed as members of our respective committees in the House and the Senate be able to provide funding for highways.

As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] knows, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] knows, we have not stopped anybody over on the authorizing committee from also authorizing and providing contract authority for specific highway demonstration projects. That has happened in the past under ISTEA. We are told it may happen in the future. I think we have got a ways to go. I think this is a good beginning.

I know that the chairman recalled that in an actual vote on the House side, all of the Democrats on our side of the aisle did not oppose him. Indeed, to a person, we supported his effort to not—we think this is a good beginning—to not designate highway demo projects. Many of us think that perhaps we can move forward next year and do the same thing, when it comes to transit. Maybe we should do exactly the same thing when it comes to buses and other kinds of projects of that nature.

We think it is a good beginning, Mr. Speaker. So, therefore, I want to finally only thank specifically two Members without whom I could not have operated my first term as ranking member of a Subcommittee on Appropriations, Ms. Cheryl Smith and Christy Coburn for their hard work. Cheryl has

had to wear on our side many hats this session. She had to juggle her responsibilities of this subcommittee as well as to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. She has done an exemplary job, and then Ms. Coburn also from my office staff who has worked with the committee on all of these issues.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Transportation appropriations conference report. It is a responsible bill—one that I believe all Members can support.

I want to thank my chairman, Mr. WOLF, for having the patience over the last few weeks waiting to get this bill through conference and onto the floor. On his first trip through the process as chairman, he has done a masterful job of crafting this legislation that is before us today and I commend him on his efforts.

It is important to note that there are many good things in the bill which keep us on message. This bill, while providing for a strong national infrastructure, also includes many policy statements that will benefit our Nation immediately and in the future. A good example must be the fact that there are no highway demonstration projects in this bill. What that means is there are no unforeseen priorities that the States have to take into consideration. What this means is that there is more money for States to accomplish their priorities in a timely manner. Having no highway demonstration projects in the bill gives the legislation integrity, and it gives the States confidence in the way we conduct business. This is what the American people and the State governments expect and this is what they deserve.

In my home State of Texas, a donor State, highway spending will increase by \$31 million over last year's level. Hopefully, this increase will assist the State in their construction of some important projects including several U.S. Highway 59 projects through my district. The conference agreement also approves continued funding for Houston metro's regional bus plan. Houston Metro is noted for having the lowest cost-per-new-rider index in the Nation. The continued funding for this program will assist in the efficient movement of people, goods, and services through the Houston area.

With regards to airports, the conference elected to fund airport improvement programs at last year's level. In the face of both competing funding demands and ironclad budget constraints, I am pleased that were at least able to halt the downward funding spiral that airports have experienced over the last 3 years. However, in light of future air travel demands, I feel that it is important that Congress be ready with a plan that allows for the proper financing of our airport infrastructure in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, a bill all Members can support. I urge all Members to support this responsible measure before us today.

□ 1330

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 29, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 735]

YEAS—393

Allard	Dickey	Houghton
Archer	Dicks	Hoyer
Armey	Dingell	Hunter
Bachus	Dixon	Hutchinson
Baesler	Doggett	Hyde
Baker (CA)	Dooley	Inglis
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Istook
Baldacci	Dornan	Jackson-Lee
Ballenger	Doyle	Jacobs
Barcia	Dreier	Jefferson
Barr	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Ehlers	Johnston
Bass	Ehrlich	Jones
Bateman	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bentsen	Engel	Kasich
Bereuter	English	Kelly
Berman	Ensign	Kennedy (MA)
Bevill	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bilbray	Evans	Kennelly
Bilirakis	Everett	Kildee
Bishop	Ewing	Kim
Bliley	Farr	King
Blute	Fattah	Kingston
Boehlert	Fawell	Klecza
Boehner	Fazio	Klink
Bonilla	Fields (TX)	Klug
Bonior	Flake	Knollenberg
Bono	Flanagan	Kolbe
Boucher	Foley	LaFalce
Brewster	Forbes	LaHood
Browder	Ford	Lantos
Brown (CA)	Fowler	Largent
Brown (FL)	Fox	Latham
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	LaTourette
Brownback	Franks (CT)	Laughlin
Bryant (TN)	Franks (NJ)	Lazio
Bryant (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Leach
Bunn	Frisa	Levin
Bunning	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Furse	Lewis (GA)
Burton	Gallegly	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Ganske	Lightfoot
Callahan	Gedensson	Lincoln
Calvert	Gekas	Linder
Camp	Gephardt	Lipinski
Canady	Geren	Livingston
Cardin	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Castle	Gilchrest	Lofgren
Chabot	Gillmor	Longley
Chambliss	Gilman	Lowey
Chenoweth	Gonzalez	Lucas
Christensen	Goodlatte	Luther
Chrysler	Goodling	Maloney
Clay	Gordon	Manton
Clayton	Goss	Manzullo
Clement	Graham	Markey
Clinger	Green	Martini
Coble	Greenwood	Mascara
Coburn	Gunderson	Matsui
Coleman	Gutierrez	McCarthy
Collins (GA)	Gutknecht	McCollum
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Combest	Hall (TX)	McDade
Condit	Hamilton	McDermott
Conyers	Hancock	McHale
Cooley	Hansen	McHugh
Costello	Harman	McInnis
Cox	Hastert	McIntosh
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	McKinney
Crane	Hayes	McNulty
Crapo	Hayworth	Meehan
Cremeans	Hefley	Meek
Cubin	Hefner	Metcalf
Cunningham	Heineman	Meyers
Davis	Herger	Mfume
de la Garza	Hilleary	Mica
Deal	Hinchey	Miller (CA)
DeFazio	Hobson	Miller (FL)
DeLauro	Hoekstra	Minge
DeLay	Hoke	Mink
Dellums	Holden	Moakley
Deutsch	Horn	Molinari
Diaz-Balart	Hostettler	Mollohan

Montgomery	Richardson	Stump
Moorhead	Riggs	Stupak
Moran	Rivers	Talent
Morella	Roberts	Tanner
Murtha	Roemer	Tate
Myers	Rogers	Tauzin
Myrick	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Neal	Rose	Tejeda
Neuherrcutt	Roth	Thomas
Neumann	Roukema	Thompson
Ney	Royce	Thornberry
Norwood	Sabo	Thornton
Nussle	Salmon	Thurman
Oberstar	Sanford	Tiahrt
Obey	Sawyer	Torkildsen
Olver	Saxton	Torricelli
Ortiz	Scarborough	Towns
Orton	Schiff	Upton
Owens	Schroeder	Velazquez
Oxley	Schumer	Vento
Packard	Scott	Visclosky
Pallone	Seastrand	Vucanovich
Parker	Serrano	Waldholtz
Pastor	Shadegg	Walker
Paxon	Shaw	Walsh
Payne (VA)	Shays	Wamp
Pelosi	Shuster	Ward
Peterson (FL)	Skaggs	Watts (OK)
Petri	Skeen	Waxman
Pickett	Smith (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Porter	Smith (TX)	White
Portman	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Poshard	Solomon	Wicker
Pryce	Souder	Wise
Quillen	Spence	Wolf
Quinn	Spratt	Woolsey
Radanovich	Stark	Wyden
Rahall	Stearns	Wynn
Ramstad	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Rangel	Stockman	Young (FL)
Reed	Stokes	Zeliff
Regula	Studds	Zimmer

## NAYS—29

Ackerman	Hilliard	Schaefer
Andrews	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Becerra	Martinez	Slaughter
Bellenson	Menendez	Torres
Borski	Payne (NJ)	Trafficant
Clyburn	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Collins (IL)	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Danner	Roybal-Allard	Williams
Filner	Rush	Yates
Foglietta	Sanders	

## NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Chapman	Skelton	Wilson
Fields (LA)	Tucker	
Funderburk	Volkmer	

□ 1353

Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FOGLIETTA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CLAY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. 4, THE SEPARATE ENROLLMENT AND LINE ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on the Senate bill (S. 4) to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEUTSCH moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the House amendments to the bill S. 4 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to insist upon the inclusion of provisions to require that the bill apply to the targeted tax benefit provisions of any revenue or reconciliation bill enacted into law during or after fiscal year 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, on February 6 of this year, this House passed by a 294 vote a line-item veto bill. The Senate subsequently passed the vote as well. It took 7 months. We went through the winter, the spring, the summer, and then we came into the fall, just about the fall again, and September 20, conferees were appointed.

I think there is a question, really, of the sincerity of conferees and appointing conferees when it has taken this long. This is an idea which not only has the support or the voting support of the majority of the Members of this House, but I really think a clear majority of the American people as well: 38 States have line-item vetoes. If we are talking about fiscal restraint, this is the way to go.

What this proposal does, Mr. Speaker, what this motion to instruct says is if we are going to have a line-item veto, let us get the job done. Let us apply it to 1995 appropriations bills and budget bills.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. We are in the midst of a prolonged hearing on the reconciliation bill up in the Committee on Rules. We have listened to five witnesses over 3½ hours. We have 65 more to go. Hopefully, we will be able to bring the Members a bill tomorrow.

Let me just say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], if he will pay attention over there, without all the discussion, he mentioned or questioned the sincerity of the conferees. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to question his sincerity. I do not think we should do that. He is a friend of mine, and he is a good Member of this body. But, I just have to point out, it is strange that his name appears on the National Taxpayers Union list of big spenders, and yet, he is up here talking about the sincerity of the conferees on the line-item veto. That bothers me a little bit.

First, let me just say this. The amendment does not do what the gen-

tleman claims it does. Neither the House nor the Senate version of the line-item veto contained any retroactive provisions dealing with targeted tax benefits.

The House version did contain retroactive language regarding the applicability to appropriation measures for fiscal year 1995, but that authority was not extended to revenue measures. The gentleman's motion calls upon conferees to apply the targeted tax provisions to any revenue or any reconciliation measure enacted into law during fiscal year 1995. At the same time, the motion urges the conferees to stay within the scope of the conference. These instructions are inconsistent. We cannot have it both ways.

If the gentleman had not included the phrase "within the scope of the conference," he would have been deliberately instructing the conferees to go beyond the scope of the conference, which the gentlemen well knows would be a violation of the rules of the House, and subject to a point or order.

Because he did include this phrase, we can only conclude that this entire motion is purely politically driven, a poor attempt to try and embarrass those Members who happen to support both the line-item veto and the landmark balanced budget we will be approving here on this floor tomorrow.

Because the gentleman's motion is inherently contradictory, I urge that we accept the motion and can honestly state that we will follow the instructions. We will make the line-item veto, as it applies to targeted tax benefits, as retroactive as possible within "his amendment," the scope of the conference, which, according to the gentleman's motion, is not retroactive at all.

□ 1400

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, they are important groups and I seek their support. The organization that you mention is not one of them.

Let me also mention that I would like to offer a wager to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], of Florida oranges versus New York apples, as the whether this is ultimately adopted into law. In front of the world I offer the gentleman that wager. If the gentleman is willing to accept it, I would be happy for him to accept it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take the gentleman's bet.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The line-item veto was always intended to apply both to appropriations

and to targeted tax benefits. House conferees have already been instructed to make the line-item veto applicable to current and future fiscal year appropriations. The motion offered by Mr. DEUTSCH reemphasizes that current and future targeted tax breaks should also be covered.

Some have suggested that after receiving publicity for passing the line-item veto, Republican proponents of this legislation wanted to deny President Clinton use of the line-item veto against appropriations bill and against special interest tax breaks.

Floor debate earlier this year suggested that the majority wanted to move ahead in a bipartisan way and also to encourage cooperation between the legislative and executive branches.

Speaker GINGRICH said at that time:

For those who think that this city has to always break down into partisanship, you have a Republican majority giving to a Democratic President this year without any gimmick an increased power over spending, which we think is an important step for America, and therefore it is an important step on a bipartisan basis to do it for the President of the United States without regard to party or ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I do not personally support the line-item veto, but if it is the answer to the country's spending problems that its proponents say it is, then this President should have it now.

Once Congress cedes the line-item veto to a President, it is unlikely ever to get it back. In the future, there will always be Presidents to whom the Congress may not want to give line-item veto power, but they will not have that choice.

If the majority truly believes that the head of the executive branch deserves this power, then there is no excuse to deny him such power now. To deny it is to admit that the bill is merely an exercise in political gamesmanship, to be discarded once it has served its purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second instruction that has been brought to the floor on the line-item veto. I offered the first dealing with applicability of the line-item veto to appropriations, and my motion passed by voice vote. Mr. DEUTSCH's motion also deserves bipartisan support. His is especially timely as we prepare to consider the omnibus budget reconciliation bill, which contains numerous provisions deserving the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for the gentleman's motion.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], a very valued member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for recognizing me and for his leadership on this important issue for our country. We on the House side agree, I think with what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is trying to do and trying to accomplish. Mr. Speaker, 294 Members of the House agreed to limit the use of tax benefits

to certain individuals or special interests, and therefore, we agree with the underlying premise of the motion, but no retroactivity language is in either the House or Senate versions dealing with tax benefits. Because it is outside the scope of the conference, it will be subject to a point of order in both the House and the Senate.

I think the gentleman from Florida and others realize that we still have a fight on our hands to get a strong line-item veto in the hands of the President. We still have a fight to put together the right number of votes to put this over the top. I believe we are moving, and the conference committee is moving, toward agreement with the Senate, and we are getting close to producing a report that will once and for all give the President of the United States a strong line-item veto, as I think most of us support.

Mr. Speaker, I must say, as it regards the sincerity question, as a member of the conference committee, I certainly have observed that Members of the minority party who are appointed to this conference from both the House and the Senate have prefaced their remarks consistently with the statement: I am unalterably opposed to a line-item veto. I am against a line-item veto. I do not want to give the President a line-item veto.

So perhaps, if the conferees from the minority on this conference committee could join with us to do the right thing and give the President the line-item veto, we could move this process forward.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE] that the majority controls the conference committee and there are Members of your party and my party that voted against this. The Republican party, the day it wants, can pass out of conference without a doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Florida for, one, bringing this motion to instruct to the floor and also for yielding myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when the debate came up not only in our committee, and I serve on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, I supported the line-item veto both in the committee and also on the floor. I served 20 years in the legislature where we lived under the line-item veto, and I always joked I had the distinction of having line-item veto by both Republicans and Democrats when I was in the legislature, so it was bipartisan.

During my campaigns for a couple of years people said, "Well, we need the line-item veto to control Federal spending." It is not the panacea to control Federal spending. It is just a small weapon in the arsenal to do it.

I guess my concern and the reason I am rising today in support of my colleague from Florida is that the line-item veto has a great deal of bipartisan support; and it seems amazing, here we are at the end of the tenth month of this year and we have not seen it come back to us out of conference committee. In fact, again, as my ranking member on the committee mentioned, this is the second instruction that we have had.

We need to see that as part of the Contract With America and one of the items I supported to my colleague from Massachusetts, because I think it is a good program, it is something that not just future Presidents, but this President should do.

Mr. Speaker, I remember several months ago that this bill was part of the Republican's Contract With America. In fact, the majority took great pains to pose on former President Reagan's birthday and provided, as my colleague Mr. OBEY tells us, holy pictures and likes to say and show their devotion to the Contract With America.

Well, I am sorry that President Reagan has not been able to enjoy the actual gift that they were going to give to him. The problem is, evidently, that maybe they like the idea of line-item veto, but maybe not for President Clinton.

Again, I have had the honor of having items vetoed by both Republican and Democrat Governors in Texas and what is good for the goose is good for the gander. I would hope that before we stay here too long that we will see that come out of the conference committee, a real line-item veto that the President can deal with.

Again, I regret my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, our chairman of the Committee on Rules, talking about my colleague being listed by some lobby group as a big spender. That group that he mentioned, I noticed a lot of folks from both parties are on their list. Sometimes I wonder if people are more interested in perpetuating their groups than they are actually looking at the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would hope that my Republican colleagues, to paraphrase St. Augustine, will remember saying, Lord, I am really for the line-item veto, but just not yet.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that some issues are coming out here that are rather clear.

First of all, I think everybody understands that bringing this subject up at this point is a fine time to again focus a little interest on the line-item veto for those of us who want it and have been working very hard to get it. In fact, we have been trying to get it out of conference as rapidly as we can.

I am delighted to have the opportunity to get up and say publicly to the world we are working on this, and we are working on it as rapidly and as faithfully as we can, as we promised we would, to the body.

But it has not been quite as easy as some might imagine. The other body, in fact, has some very significant differences of opinion. We have had an open conference meeting so far. We have met. It turns out that the gap that we predicted was there is, in fact, there.

The other body has some things called special enrollment procedures, some sunset ideas, some things that are very different than what we wanted and are working out to get a tough, effective line-item veto that works for the great majority here who supported that.

So I can report back and I am happy to take advantage of this time and this motion to say that progress is being made and faithful pursuit of the commitment is, in fact, under way.

Now, without sounding partisan, because I do not think we need any more strident, red-hot rhetoric and partisanship out here on this issue right now, I would point out that it strikes me that the main opposition we are getting is from the gentleman who makes the motion, his own party in the other body, from some of the more revered and senior Members, I would say. Again, I do not want to speak out of school about what is going on in conference committee.

I would also point out that the problem with the motion to instruct conferees that we have before us today is self-canceling.

The gentleman, my friend from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], well knows that we have to stay within the scope of the conference. The problem is that we have to stick within the scope, and we therefore cannot reach back into decisions about tax provisions that occur before the line-item veto becomes law. That is not within scope.

So what the motion to instruct involves is something that is impossible to do within the Rules of the House. Consequently, what we have is a somewhat meaningless motion in front of us, a meaningless resolution in front of us.

However, I am willing to take that meaninglessness in terms of the substance and try and turn it into a self-purpose by saying, I am glad we have the opportunity to report back to the gentleman and those who care that, indeed, progress is going forward, and I believe we should accept this motion in the interests of bipartisan cooperation to reinforce that position of the House team in conference that will, in fact, accomplish the line-item veto according to what we wanted to be in the House at the very earliest opportunity.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I am hearing sort of a repetition of debate. I keep hearing

being pointed out that there are Democrats opposed to this issue. There are also Republicans opposed to this issue, but they have been in the majority not that long. Maybe they have not gotten it yet, that they, in fact, are in the majority now; and they do not need any of our votes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I also support the line-item veto, and I applaud the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] for moving this issue forward.

The American people want the line-item veto, and they want the line-item veto because they are concerned about two things: They are concerned, on the one hand, about pork barrel spending. They want to see an end to pork barrel spending. On the other hand, they also want to see an end to special interest tax breaks that are tucked away into revenue bills. I think that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] does a good job in pointing these two things out.

The American people also want us to act now. They do not want us to go forth with business as usual and say, Well, let us just have one more round, one more for the road, one more round of special interest tax breaks and pork barrel spending in this year's revenues bills. What they want us to do is they want us to act to have it apply to the revenue bills and the appropriation bills that are moving through Congress right now.

They do not want the Republicans, who I understand where they are coming from. They have been out of power a long time. They have a lot of Christmas tree presents that they want to hang, and they want to hang them on these bills. But that is not what the election last fall was all about. The election last fall was ending that type of practice. So I think that the Republicans would be best served if they would just acknowledge what everybody in here knows, and that is that the American people want this practice to stop and they want this practice to stop right now.

Now, the charges that go back and forth on the floor today from the Republicans is that they are saying that the Democrats really are not concerned about this, that they are opposed to it. Well, as Mr. DEUTSCH pointed out, there are many of us who support this.

□ 1415

We frankly are somewhat dubious of the motives of the Republicans because we think what they are going to do is they are going to keep confereeing and confereeing and confereeing until we get to the middle of next year and then pass a measure so President Clinton does not have the opportunity to get rid of their pork.

The best way for us to come together is for the Republicans and the Democrats to say, well, let us do it right

now. Let us pass this measure and let us have this measure apply to appropriation bills right now. Then we can all walk away with clean hands. That is what the American people want.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman be willing to use his articulate argument on some members of his own party in the other body? Because in the other body, the gentleman well understands, we only have 53 of us over there and there is something called filibuster and cloture problems.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I would be more than happy to.

Mr. GOSS. We need members of the gentleman's party to help us.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I would be more than happy to. As I have indicated here and as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] has indicated, certainly you in the majority have the power in this body to move forward. The problem in appointing conferees came from this body. That is where the delay was. It was only September 20 that the Speaker in this body appointed those conferees. So there was a lot of foot-dragging, but the foot-dragging was on this side of the aisle.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. I would admit that it did not go as rapidly as I wanted, but in 9 months we got further than your party got in 40 years and I think that is a fair comment.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I think the test is going to be when this bill reaches the President's desk. If you drag your feet until mid September of next year, then you have succeeded in your goal. That is, depriving President Clinton of the ability to get rid of your pork-barrel spending and your special interest tax loopholes.

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will yield further, with your help, that will not happen.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as our freshman class came in, we fought for the line-item veto. The second class to follow that fought for the line-item veto, the 73 Members, and most of them voted for it.

What I have found in the couple of hundred days that we have been here is if we take a look at the delaying tactics, the gridlock tactics of the business at hand.

Let us get through the balanced budget, let us get through the Medicare, let us get through the tax back to the people, let us get back to welfare reform. Let us take care of the business at hand.

We have got everything to go before Christmas. Yes, I have bought my

Christmas tree here because I think we are going to be here at Christmas.

When we get through with that business, we will bring up the line-item veto. But until you quit your delaying tactics on all the legislation from your liberal leadership, then we will never get it done.

Looking at every single bill that we have here, they want to continue spending. There is always a good reason for it. They want to continue more spending.

Your heart is not in what you are saying. Some of the Members are and they fought for line-item veto and I appreciate that. But the overall leadership of the Democratic Party does not have their heart in it and they will not follow through and the continuing gridlock will not allow us to bring it up.

Help us do that and we will be more than happy to bring it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am going to point out two things. One to my good friend and colleague from Florida, there is a reconciliation bill that we are going to take up actually in a very short period of time that is this high, or higher. It includes untold numbers of pieces of legislation. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules. He probably does not even know how many different bills.

My colleague still has time. There is another bill you can put in reconciliation, which is the line-item veto bill. That in fact deals with your issue of the Senate filibuster, because as the gentleman is well aware, in the Senate the reconciliation bill needs only 50 votes, or 51 votes. Actually 50 votes because that is something that the President has supported. I assume the Vice President will follow the President's leads on that issue.

You have put everything else in the reconciliation bill. Here is your opportunity to do the right thing.

I have to respond to my colleague's last statement on the floor. Gridlock. My God, when this Chamber has wanted to do something, the rules of this House allow you to do things pretty darn fast when you want to do them fast, without debate, without any discussion. You get it done. We have 1 day hearing, less than a day of hearing on Medicare, 27 days on Whitewater, 84 days on Ruby Ridge. You guys control the time.

There is an incredible limit in terms of what we can do. You can do it today. Here is your opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion. I voted for the line-item veto. I campaigned on it as well as I talked to people across the 13th District in Michigan. I believe the line-item veto is an effective tool in controlling spending in this House and more importantly in reining in the cronyism which tends to permeate the whole appropriations process.

Even in this supposedly reformed Congress, we have seen more than a little pork work its way into the budget. I have voted to cut billions of dollars, many others have as well, and many others were unsuccessful in removing pieces of the budget.

The question of whether or not people are being sincere in their activities since they are now in conference begs the issue of why it took so long to send people to conference. I am left to question whether or not we are dealing with real values here, real principles, or, rather, situational political posturing that says, a line-item veto is good for a Republican President but not very good for a Democratic President.

I put aside my partisan differences to vote for this veto because I believed it was the right thing to do. I would ask the conferees to do exactly the same in order to pass this proposal into law. Our constituents sent us here to do a job, not to fight, not to whine, not to rely on our party affiliation, but to do a job, and they want this veto. Move it now.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I just felt that it is important that we understand that we in this body, in the House, are much blessed by orderly rules and a wonderful Committee on Rules that makes sure that things are properly brought forward.

I believe the suggestion of my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], that we throw this thing into some kind of an omnibus reconciliation bill because we have already passed it on the floor would make sense from the House side. Indeed it might. But we have a problem on the other side. Again, maybe the gentleman and some of his colleagues on that side of the aisle can help us with somebody over there who has a special rule in the other body, where they have a different approach than we do, might be able to prevail on them. Because it still takes the necessary number of votes to overcome objections and the procedures in the other body.

This is not where the problem is here. I know the gentleman from Florida is not suggesting anything as diabolical as that we have got one group in his party here revving this thing up and another group in his party stopping it over there. That would be unthinkable.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I was a little naive when I came here on the evening of February 6 to speak in favor of this line-item veto initiative. You see, I labored as a new Member under the misimpression that there might be a way for some genuine bipartisan participation to do something about the

budget deficit, to provide some new tools to get a handle on this Nation's financing, and to change business as usual in this House.

So I, along with other Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, spoke in favor of the Republican initiative on the line-item veto. We have it in Texas. Democrats and Republican Governors alike have used the line-item veto and have used it effectively. I was particularly impressed with the last speaker on the night of February 6 on this issue, the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH. This was not a speech like so many, one of these gloating speeches about we won and you are dumb. No; this was a serious speech in favor of the line-item veto in which Speaker GINGRICH allowed as how he as a Republican in an act of bipartisanship wanted to be sure that President Clinton, a Democrat, had the line-item veto power in order to get at pork barrel in this budget.

What happened after all the speeches were said and done? Well, the Senate on a bipartisan basis proceeded to act, and they passed the measure. By March or April, they had appointed conferees to consider the line-item veto. And what happened at this rostrum? Nothing. Nothing happened. Nothing happened in March, nothing happened in April, nothing happened in May, nothing happened in June, nothing happened in July, nothing happened in August, and nothing happened through most of the month of September because despite the fine speech that was given here, the Speaker did not want to give President Clinton the power to use the line-item veto to cut through this pork that has been put in these appropriations bills. That is not my opinion alone. Various Republican Members of the U.S. Senate have voiced the same concern about the delay that has transpired month after month, that it was all talk and no action. We saw the very same thing happen here this morning. There is a lobby reform bill that the Senate on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats coming together, passed 98 to 0.

What happens to it over here? It is still sitting there this afternoon. It has been sitting there for 3 months. The Speaker will not even refer this lobby reform bill to a committee to study it. That is not revolutionary, despite all the proclamations that have been made here about these great revolutionaries reforming the way the budget is handled, reforming the way this House acts, but it is a little revolting that we cannot get bipartisanship to resolve these problems.

I salute the gentleman from Florida for coming here and keeping his word. These people may break their word about what they say they are willing to do on line-item veto but at least you are providing us another opportunity to really come to grips with this problem.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], one of the champions of the line-item veto and a member of the conference committee.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think those colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the most part are very serious about this issue, as we are, have a sense of urgency with the state of fiscal affairs in our country and think that the line-item veto would work in our system of government here at the Federal level like it does in 43 some odd States including my State of Massachusetts, the State of Texas and many, many other States of the union. But I am hearing some very serious selective memory loss problems here on the other side. Because as someone who is relatively new to this Chamber, I recall watching the debates years and years ago in which President Reagan as early as 1981 asked for the line-item veto, and the then majority denied him that line-item veto each and every year of his tenure. Then President Bush was elected and he asked for the line-item veto, and the then majority denied him the line-item veto each and every year. Then President Clinton was elected, and he asked for a strong line-item veto, in the first 2 years of his tenure, and the then majority denied him, their own President, a strong line-item veto.

The new majority has been in office now for about 10 months. In addition to coming forward with the reform of our welfare system, reform of Medicare, Medicaid, and a reconciliation package that I think will bring us toward a balanced budget, we have also gone to conference committee on the line-item veto in 10 short months.

Let us be serious with the American people. In any comparison of who is moving forward quickly on this agenda item, I think the new majority here has to get great credit for moving quickly. It is not easy. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who are opposed to the line-item veto on principled grounds but they have strong reasons for opposing it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume on two points.

One is there is no Member of this Chamber, no political party in this country that has a monopoly on wisdom. I credit my Republican colleagues for moving some issues that I supported and I supported in the last Congress. In fact, this House passed out a line-item veto in this Congress. The House did. The Senate did not in the last Congress.

Again, this truly is a bipartisan issue. This is what is the right thing, 38 States have it, and the thing I think that the American people want. But also let me talk about disingenuous, and I think the American people to some extent are watching this, they

have the ability to watch this, this debate going on.

How disingenuous can someone be to take 7 months to appoint conferees? This is not rocket science. This is not building the Taj Mahal. This is not building the space shuttle. This is naming five people. Just like writing the names. Again, and this is out of a high-technology office, they probably have computers there and they can probably even pull the computers out so it is probably seven key strokes.

□ 1430

To take each month, if they did one keystroke, it is totally disingenuous. The smiles and smirks on the other side on this issue really are disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to do a little revising and extending of some of my own remarks here for just a moment. I was one of those that opposed the line item veto for many years because I believe giving any President one-third plus one minority override was too much power, and I argued that point. I argued it again this year, but a little bit differently.

I came to believe several years ago that line item veto was a good thing and a very positive thing. But I still did not want to give a President one-third plus one. I wanted to give majority rule. In other words, if any President were to go in and veto CHARLIE STENHOLM's favorite line item, that is, somebody else's definition of pork, he could do so. It would be my charge to get 50 percent plus one of my colleagues to agree with me. If the President got 50 percent to agree with him, it would go. I argued that this year, and we lost.

Those who believe true line-item veto, one-third plus one won on the floor of the House.

I have been looking at this and listening to this debate. Tomorrow you will get a chance to vote again for line item veto, H.R. 2. I will vote for it because I believe now those who have convinced me that giving a President one-third plus one is something that is very, very important. So I have changed my mind to the degree that I now believe it is time to do that, whoever the President is.

But I find it very interesting in listening to some of the debate today saying we cannot do it because of the Senate. The Byrd rule is 60 votes. At any time two-thirds of the House or the Senate wish to give a President line item veto, it may be done. I think it is time to turn up the ratchet. I think it is time to turn up the heat bipartisanly and say to both bodies, to the conferees, let us agree on what we are going to give this President and the next President and let us do it now. Let us make it applicable to this year's reconciliation bill, this year's tax bill,

this year's appropriation bills, because I think it will be very helpful to a lot of the other debate going on concerning the reconciliation bill and how we are going to get a balanced budget by the year 2002, which I totally agree with. So I have been listening very, very carefully to all of the debate that is going on and about a train wreck and how we can avoid it.

I think it is extremely important for all of us now, both sides of the aisle, people like me that have had reservations about doing a line item veto, like some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been wanting to do; I have been putting a lot of time and effort into the thought processes, and I think now is the time for us to test this theory and do it the right way.

Let us instruct the conferees in the House and send the message to the other body. Now is the time for us to do this because it will be very constructive to avoiding a train wreck and to getting us to make the tough decisions that are going to be required in getting to a balanced budget in the year 2002.

So I encourage my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let us look at this issue as it is being portrayed today and support this motion.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the reason why I wanted this time is because I wanted to point out we have heard repeatedly during this debate on the other side the conferees are doing this and they are doing that. What I want to ask is when were these meetings held. I am a conferee also. I have been to one meeting at which we gave these great speeches and nothing more.

So my question is: When have we had all of these conferences? If so, the Democrats have been left out. I would ask that of the committee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], when have we had conference meetings?

Mr. CLINGER. If the gentlewoman will yield, as the gentlewoman well knows, in preparing a conference report, obviously there are staff discussions that lead up to member meetings. The staff discussions have been going on at a very vigorous rate, very expedited rate. We anticipate we will have a members' meetings soon because many of the issues in dispute are being resolved. I think we are going to be able to move to that.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, my staff tells me they have not been invited to any meetings in conference. I would just like to say to the chairman that I would very much appreciate it if the minority staff are invited to these conference staff meetings on this particular issue.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Florida



[Mr. DEUTSCH] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] has 18 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to realize this line-item veto is only half of the line-item veto that we were offered in the Contract With America. The portion about giving line-item power to remove tax loopholes, that went out the door anyway, and now the question is whether we get the other half on spending, and I would just yield the rest of my time to anyone on the Republican side that can explain why it took the Speaker from the spring to September 20 to appoint conferees. If there is any explanation other than to thwart President Clinton's use of it, I would love to hear it. Clearly, the only reason was to thwart President Clinton's use of the line-item veto to get at pork barrel.

If there is any other reason why the Senate appointed conferees in March and April, the House had to wait to name those five conferees all that time, this would be a good time to explain it.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLINGER. I would just throw the question back. We would like to know on this side of the aisle, while your party was in control of the Congress, why we did not get any opportunity to deal with line-item veto.

Mr. DOGGETT. I think that does answer the question. There is no reason that they could offer other than to thwart President Clinton.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to say we have had an interesting debate, an interesting discussion.

The other side has had an opportunity to beat their breast and make some political points about why we have taken so long to get to conference. I think we have to really focus on what is at issue here, and that is the gist of what the gentleman proposes in his motion to instruct. I am not going to oppose it, because it really has no meaning. It really does not have any impact.

While both the House and Senate bills apply a line-item veto to targeted tax benefits, presented after the date of the line-item veto's enactment, neither S. 4 or H.R. 2 apply the line-item veto retroactive to any tax provisions, and, therefore, tax benefits enacted prior to signing H.R. 2 are not within the scope of either bill and remain fully outside the scope of the conference.

Therefore, by the very terms of the gentleman's motion to stay within the scope of the conference, that is an impossibility, given the nature of the instruction.

So it is an exercise, obviously, to give the other side an opportunity to talk about these things. But the impact of it is meaningless. I am not going to oppose it, because it has no impact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, this body is the greatest deliberative body in the world. I mean, I have a thrill every time I come into this Chamber, and really thank God that I have the opportunity to serve the people of my district and the people of this country.

I think what the people of this country want from us is nothing more than taking the high road. That is what they want from us. You know, there is an old expression that all of us know: If it walks like a duck and sounds like a duck and quacks like a duck and smells like a duck and feels like a duck, you know, there is probably a pretty darn good chance it is a duck.

You know, if it sounds like you are delaying, if it sounds like you are delaying, if it talks like you are delaying, if it smells like you are delaying, if it hears like you are delaying, if it feels like you are delaying, then you are delaying.

You can protest as much as you want. But, you know, I just do not believe it stands up to the light of day.

Let me talk about something that has been reported in the press today. This is a USA Today article talking about some of the tax breaks that are in the reconciliation bill as it is coming before us, things like college football coaches, college football coaches. You can read it in today's USA Today: College football, not basketball coaches or volleyball coaches, but college football coaches get a special tax break because they have friends in powerful places. Convenience store owners, because of a large company in a particular Member's district, get a special tax break, and that is someone from Oklahoma who is able to get that into the bill. I mean, this is business as usual. This would make Dan Rostenkowski proud.

Let me just say that, you know, that is what is going on, and that is what should not be going on. If my colleagues on the other side want to be the majority party into the next century, then shame, shame, shame, shame. They should not be doing this.

The same thing in terms of appropriations. Here is a list that my staff prepared for me of really turkeys, I mean outrageous, turkeys, that, you know, it seems as if what is going on to pass this reconciliation bill is a bidding war. You know, Members come and they say, "This is what I need and buy me off and give it to me." Well, that is business as usual. That is not what the American people want.

Again, I say to my colleagues on the other side, the smartest thing they can

do and the best politically but also from a policy perspective is to stop playing the games and pass this bill.

As has been pointed out before, there are 38 States in this country that provide a line-item veto for their Governors, and it has also been pointed out, I served 10 years in the State legislature in Florida.

I served under Republican Governors and served under Democratic Governors as well. I tell you the system worked. It worked in Florida. I have talked to Members from other States. It has worked there. Not only does it give the Governor an opportunity to veto turkeys, outrageous things like these outrageous things like this that we are going to be voting on that are flat-out wrong. What it does, it prevents them from happening. People do not want to be embarrassed by highlighting those issues that might be in there.

You know, it is a very simple debate, as well. The bill needs to apply to this year. If there is going to be line-item veto, apply it this year. There is no rational policy reason why it should not apply to this year, and, you know, we both talk about how we want to get away from the partisan politics, and that is not why people sent us here. I mean, I represent everyone in my district whether they are registered as a Democrat, as a Republican, or Independent or any other party. Americans are Americans. They are not Americans by party definition. What is good for this country does not just fall on individuals in political parties. It is good for this country, and it continues to make this country the greatest country in the world and the greatest country in the history of the world.

I really urge my colleagues who have the ability on the other side of the aisle to use their majority as it should be used, to do the right thing, not to talk on the floor and say one thing but take 7 months to appoint conferees, to smirk when we are talking about issues in terms of resolving this issue, which just has not been done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would stand to urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct conferees.

I have been laboring for many years here to bring to pass a line-item veto. In concept, there are many ways to accomplish it, whether through enhanced rescission, through the line-item veto provisions we recommended earlier in the year. How it is accomplished is not as important as accomplishing it.

I believe that there are some concerns about the constitutionality of some of these issues, but it is proper to instruct conferees at this point.

Let me just add a word of caution. If all we do is instruct conferees and the conferees never really meet and we never really have a conference report,

we still have not accomplished anything. We have been working now for many months to try to push forward the line-item veto concept. I asked on five different appropriation bills to include line-item veto. Rules would not make it in order.

□ 1445

We have attempted to have it included and, in fact, there is one certain way that all of my colleagues could ensure that line-item veto would apply this year, and that is pass the coalition budget alternative tomorrow, the budget reconciliation alternative, because we have this very provision in the coalition budget reconciliation alternative. It would apply line-item veto to the 1996 spending cycle.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman surely is aware that the provision included in his bill tomorrow would be subject to some provisions in the Senate that probably would see it stricken?

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate could in fact try to strike it. Does that mean that because the other body may try to strike it that we do not act? I think we have to continue to act, to push forth what the people who elected us and sent us here to do want us to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 44, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 736]

YEAS—381

Ackerman	Barton	Borski
Allard	Bass	Boucher
Andrews	Bateman	Brewster
Archer	Bentsen	Browder
Army	Berman	Brown (CA)
Bachus	Bevill	Brown (FL)
Baessler	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Baker (CA)	Bilirakis	Brownback
Baker (LA)	Bishop	Bryant (TN)
Baldacci	Bliley	Bryant (TX)
Ballenger	Blute	Bunn
Barcia	Boehlert	Bunning
Barr	Boehner	Burr
Barrett (NE)	Bonilla	Burton
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Buyer
Bartlett	Bono	Callahan

Calvert	Gunderson	Mfume
Camp	Gutierrez	Mica
Canady	Gutknecht	Miller (CA)
Cardin	Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Castle	Hall (TX)	Minge
Chabot	Hamilton	Moakley
Chambliss	Hancock	Molinari
Christensen	Hansen	Montgomery
Chrysler	Harman	Moorhead
Clayton	Hastert	Moran
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Morella
Clinger	Hayes	Murtha
Clyburn	Hayworth	Myrick
Coble	Hefley	Nadler
Coburn	Hefner	Neal
Coleman	Heineman	Nethercutt
Collins (GA)	Herger	Neumann
Collins (IL)	Hilleary	Ney
Collins (MI)	Hilliard	Norwood
Combest	Hinchey	Nussle
Condit	Hobson	Oberstar
Cooley	Hoekstra	Obey
Costello	Hoke	Olver
Cox	Holden	Orton
Coyne	Horn	Oxley
Cramer	Hostettler	Packard
Crane	Houghton	Pallone
Crapo	Hoyer	Parker
Creameans	Hunter	Paxon
Cubin	Hutchinson	Payne (VA)
Cunningham	Hyde	Pelosi
Danner	Inglis	Peterson (FL)
Davis	Istook	Peterson (MN)
de la Garza	Jackson-Lee	Petri
Deal	Jacobs	Pickett
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Pombo
DeLauro	Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy
DeLay	Johnson, E. B.	Porter
Deutsch	Johnson, Sam	Portman
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Poshard
Dickey	Kanjorski	Pryce
Dicks	Kaptur	Quillen
Dingell	Kasich	Quinn
Doggett	Kelly	Radanovich
Dooley	Kennedy (MA)	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Reed
Dornan	Kennelly	Regula
Doyle	Kildee	Richardson
Dreier	Kim	Riggs
Duncan	King	Rivers
Dunn	Kingston	Roberts
Durbin	Kleczka	Roemer
Edwards	Klug	Rogers
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Ehrlich	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	LaFalce	Rose
English	LaHood	Roth
Ensign	Lantos	Royce
Eshoo	Largent	Rush
Everett	Latham	Sabo
Ewing	LaTourette	Salmon
Farr	Laughlin	Sanford
Fattah	Lazio	Sawyer
Fawell	Leach	Saxton
Fazio	Levin	Scarborough
Fields (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Schaefer
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Schiff
Flake	Lightfoot	Schroeder
Flanagan	Lincoln	Schumer
Foglietta	Linder	Scott
Foley	Lipinski	Seastrand
Forbes	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Ford	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Fowler	Lofgren	Shaw
Fox	Longley	Shays
Frank (MA)	Lowe	Skaggs
Franks (CT)	Lucas	Skeen
Franks (NJ)	Luther	Skelton
Frelinghuysen	Maloney	Slaughter
Frisa	Manton	Smith (MI)
Frost	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Funderburk	Markey	Smith (TX)
Furse	Martini	Smith (WA)
Galleghy	Mascara	Solomon
Ganske	Matsui	Souder
Gejdenson	McCarthy	Spence
Gekas	McCollum	Spratt
Gephardt	McCery	Stark
Geren	McDermott	Stearns
Gibbons	McHale	Stenholm
Gilchrest	McHugh	Stockman
Gillmor	McInnis	Studds
Gilman	McIntosh	Stump
Goodlatte	McKeon	Stupak
Goodling	McNulty	Talent
Gordon	Meehan	Tanner
Goss	Menendez	Tate
Graham	Metcalf	Tauzin
Green	Meyers	Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Whitfield
Tejeda	Vucanovich	Wicker
Thomas	Waldholtz	Wilson
Thornberry	Walker	Wise
Thornton	Walsh	Wolf
Thurman	Wamp	Woolsey
Tiahrt	Ward	Wyden
Torkildsen	Watts (OK)	Wynn
Torricelli	Waxman	Young (AK)
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)
Velazquez	Weller	Zeliff
Vento	White	Zimmer

NAYS—44

Abercrombie	Klink	Roukema
Becerra	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Beilenson	Martinez	Sanders
Chenoweth	McDade	Serrano
Clay	McKinney	Shuster
Conyers	Meek	Stokes
Dellums	Mink	Thompson
Dixon	Mollohan	Torres
Engel	Myers	Towns
Evans	Ortiz	Trafigant
Gonzalez	Owens	Waters
Greenwood	Pastor	Watt (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)	Williams
Jefferson	Rahall	Yates
Johnston	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—7

Bereuter	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Chapman	Tucker	
Fields (LA)	Volkmer	

□ 1506

Messrs. LEWIS of California, HASTINGS of Florida, MYERS of Indiana, TOWNS, KLINK, and CONYERS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, ZIMMER, BASS, McDERMOTT, LEWIS of Georgia, STARK, and COYNE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—DIRECTING SPEAKER TO PROVIDE REMEDY IN RESPONSE TO USE OF FORGED DOCUMENT AT A SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 244) to direct the Speaker to provide an appropriate remedy in response to the use of a forged document at a subcommittee hearing, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 244

Whereas, on September 28, 1995, the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight held a hearing on political advocacy of Federal grantees;

Whereas, the president of the Alliance for Justice, a national association of public interest and civil rights organizations testified at that hearing;

Whereas, a document was placed upon the press table for distribution at the hearing which contained the letterhead, including the name, address, phone number, fax number, and E-mail address of the Alliance for Justice, and the names of certain member organizations and the dollar amounts of Federal grants they received;

Whereas, in her opening statement at the hearing, the president of the Alliance for Justice identified the document as being forged and contained errors and requested an explanation from the chairman of the subcommittee as to the source of the document;

Whereas, in response, the chairman acknowledged that the document was created by the subcommittee staff;

Whereas, House Information Resources, at the request of the subcommittee staff, prepared the forged document;

Whereas, the document was prepared using official funds;

Whereas, the chairman of the subcommittee acknowledged in a letter, dated September 28, 1995, to the president of the Alliance for Justice that "the graphics, unfortunately, appeared to simulate the Alliance's letterhead";

Whereas, the September 29, 1995, issue of the National Journal's CongressDaily reported that Representative McIntosh's communications director said that "the letterhead was taken from a faxed document, scanned into their computer system and altered"; and

Whereas, questions continue to arise regarding the responsibility for preparation of the forced document: the chairman of the subcommittee stated during the hearing that he had no prior knowledge of the document's preparation; the chairman later stated that the subcommittee staff prepared the document; and other published reports suggested that Chairman McIntosh's personal office staff prepared the document;

Whereas, on September 27, 1995, the Speaker expressed concern over the distribution of unattributed documents and announced a policy requiring that materials disseminated on the floor of the House must bear the name of the Member authorizing their distribution;

Whereas, Members and staff of the House have an obligation to ensure the proper use of documents and other materials and exhibits prepared for use at committee and subcommittee hearings and which are made available to Members, the public or the press, and to ensure that the source of such documents or other materials is not misrepresented;

Whereas, committees and subcommittees should not create documents for use in their proceedings that may give the impression that such documents were created by other persons or organizations, as occurred at the September 28, 1995, hearing of the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs;

Whereas, the dissemination of a forged document distorts the public record and affects the ability of the House of Representatives, its committees, and Members to perform their legislative functions, and constitutes a violation of the integrity of committee proceedings which form a core of the legislative process: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Speaker shall take such action as may be necessary to provide an appropriate remedy to ensure that the integrity of the legislative process is protected, and shall report his actions and recommendations to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The resolution constitutes a question of privileges of the House under rule IX.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the floor of the House an issue of basic responsibility of the people who serve here either by election or appointment. This privileged resolution affirms the need for this House to ensure that all documents which come before us in an official capacity are accurate and authentic.

We have an obligation to history, scholars, authors, and the courts to ensure that all who serve here are cognizant of this responsibility and are determined to carry it out. Senator TRENT LOTT, when he served in the House, made an eloquent statement of the importance of the sanctity of our records:

For if the legislative history made by the duly elected Representatives of the people is subject to malicious alteration and distortion by anonymous, nonelected staffers, then the credibility of this institution, the people's branch is in serious jeopardy.

All our written records become suddenly suspect in the eyes of the people, the press, and the courts.

How much weight, for instance, are the courts likely to give to the legislative history we supposedly made as Representatives when the actual source of that history is in doubt? And yet that is the situation in which we find ourselves until the guilty are found and punished and adequate steps are taken to prevent the recurrence of such abuse [CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1983].

We must guarantee that we are putting together a fair and accurate record of our legislative history. We cannot let our standards fall.

In the past few weeks, I have participated in a number of hearings regarding the McIntosh-Istook-Ehrlich proposal to limit the political advocacy of organizations which receive Federal grants. Now, regardless of your position on this legislation, what occurred during the September 28 hearing cannot be ignored by anyone who believes that Congress must obey and follow the laws of the land. It cannot go unchallenged by anyone who claims to honorably represent the United States in these hallowed Halls of Congress. It cannot be accepted by those of us who have vowed to uphold the laws of the United States. In short, the unauthorized creation and falsification of documents, to be distributed to the general public, must not be tolerated.

At a hearing of the Government Reform and Oversight Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs on September 28, a document was placed on the press table which appeared to be on the letterhead of the Alliance for Justice. It included a logo, an address, phone number, fax number, e-mail address, and a listing of member organizations, laid out in such a manner as to replicate the alliance's own letterhead. Incorrect information was placed on this document, in such a way in which any reasonable person would believe it came from the Alliance for Justice. Because there was no disclaimer, anyone could have picked up this piece of paper, left the hearing, and remained under the false impression that this document came from the Alliance for Justice.

However, upon closer examination during the hearing, it became clear that this document was falsified. The logo was incorrect, the names of some of the member groups were inaccurate, and the amount of the grants were in error. The chair of the subcommittee has admitted that his staff created this document, and, as stated by his communications director, they had taken a faxed document, had House Information Resources scan it into their computer system, and altered it.

And, there appeared to be no understanding by the people who created the document of the seriousness of their actions.

We need to assure that this kind of deception should not, and cannot, happen in the House of Representatives. And, today we

must affirm this House's belief that all documents which are produced by us are authentic, accurate, and dependable.

We are here to represent the people of the United States. And, particularly those of us on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, we are here to provide oversight—to protect the people of this Nation from wrongdoing by the Government—the kind of wrongdoing we have witnessed by this incident.

This resolution is designed to reaffirm, to the American people, our commitment to honesty and to history. It is to protect the integrity of the legislative history. It is to safeguard our legislative proceedings and to guarantee that what we do is trustworthy and honorable. Again, we must guarantee that we put together a fair and accurate record.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of the men and women who have served this Congress in the past, and in the name of those who will come after us, we must be unwavering in our standards. Forgery will not be tolerated.

I urge adoption of this resolution.

MOTION TO LAY THE RESOLUTION ON THE TABLE  
OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] to lay on the table the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 189, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 737]

AYES—236

Allard	Chambliss	Fields (TX)
Archer	Chenoweth	Flanagan
Armey	Christensen	Foley
Bachus	Chrysler	Forbes
Baker (CA)	Clinger	Fowler
Baker (LA)	Coble	Fox
Ballenger	Coburn	Franks (CT)
Barr	Collins (GA)	Franks (NJ)
Barrett (NE)	Combust	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Condit	Frisa
Barton	Cooley	Funderburk
Bass	Cox	Gallegly
Bateman	Crane	Ganske
Bereuter	Crapo	Gekas
Bilbray	Creameans	Geren
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gilchrest
Bliley	Cunningham	Gillmor
Blute	Davis	Gilman
Boehlert	Deal	Goodlatte
Boehner	DeLay	Goss
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Bono	Dickey	Greenwood
Brownback	Doolittle	Gunderson
Bryant (TN)	Dornan	Gutknecht
Bunn	Dreier	Hall (TX)
Bunning	Duncan	Hancock
Burr	Dunn	Hansen
Burton	Ehlers	Hastert
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hastings (WA)
Callahan	Emerson	Hayes
Calvert	English	Hayworth
Camp	Ensign	Hefley
Canady	Everett	Heineman
Castle	Ewing	Herger
Chabot	Fawell	Hilleary

Hobson	McIntosh	Schiff
Hoekstra	McKeon	Seastrand
Hoke	Metcalf	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Meyers	Shadegg
Houghton	Mica	Shaw
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Shays
Hutchinson	Molinar	Shuster
Hyde	Moorhead	Skeen
Inglis	Morella	Smith (MI)
Istook	Myers	Smith (NJ)
Jacobs	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Neumann	Solomon
Jones	Ney	Souder
Kasich	Norwood	Spence
Kelly	Nussle	Stearns
Kim	Oxley	Stockman
King	Packard	Stump
Kingston	Parker	Talent
Klug	Paxon	Tate
Knollenberg	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
Kolbe	Petri	Taylor (NC)
LaHood	Pombo	Thomas
Largent	Porter	Thornberry
Latham	Portman	Tiahrt
LaTourette	Pryce	Torkildsen
Laughlin	Quillen	Upton
Lazio	Quinn	Vucanovich
Leach	Radanovich	Waldholtz
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Walker
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Walsh
Lightfoot	Riggs	Wamp
Linder	Roberts	Watts (OK)
Livingston	Rogers	Weldon (FL)
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Weller
Longley	Ros-Lehtinen	White
Lucas	Roth	Whitfield
Manzullo	Roukema	Wickert
Martini	Royce	Wolf
McCollum	Salmon	Young (AK)
McCrery	Sanford	Young (FL)
McDade	Saxton	Zeliff
McHugh	Scarborough	Zimmer
McInnis	Schaefer	

## NOES—189

Abercrombie	Fazio	McCarthy
Ackerman	Filner	McDermott
Andrews	Flake	McHale
Baesler	Foglietta	McKinney
Baldacci	Ford	McNulty
Barcia	Frank (MA)	Meehan
Barrett (WI)	Frost	Meek
Becerra	Furse	Menendez
Beilenson	Gejdenson	Mfume
Bentsen	Gephardt	Miller (CA)
Berman	Gibbons	Minge
Bevill	Gonzalez	Mink
Bishop	Gordon	Moakley
Bonior	Green	Mollohan
Borski	Gutierrez	Montgomery
Boucher	Hall (OH)	Moran
Brewster	Hamilton	Murtha
Browder	Harman	Nadler
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Brown (FL)	Hefner	Oberstar
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Obey
Bryant (TX)	Hinchey	Olver
Cardin	Holden	Ortiz
Clay	Horn	Orton
Clayton	Hoyer	Owens
Clement	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Clyburn	Jefferson	Pastor
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)
Collins (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (VA)
Collins (MI)	Johnston	Pelosi
Conyers	Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)
Costello	Kaptur	Pickett
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Cramer	Kennedy (RI)	Poshard
Danner	Kennelly	Rahall
de la Garza	Kildee	Rangel
DeFazio	Kleczka	Reed
DeLauro	Klink	Richardson
Dellums	LaFalce	Rivers
Deutsch	Lantos	Roemer
Dicks	Levin	Rose
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Dixon	Lincoln	Rush
Doggett	Lipinski	Sabo
Dooley	Lofgren	Sanders
Doyle	Lowe	Sawyer
Durbin	Luther	Schroeder
Edwards	Maloney	Schumer
Engel	Manton	Scott
Eshoo	Markey	Serrano
Evans	Martinez	Skaggs
Farr	Mascara	Skelton
Fattah	Matsui	Slaughter

Spratt	Thornton	Waters
Stark	Thurman	Watt (NC)
Stenholm	Torres	Waxman
Stokes	Torricelli	Williams
Studds	Towns	Wilson
Stupak	Trafigant	Wise
Tanner	Velazquez	Woolsey
Taylor (MS)	Vento	Wyden
Tejeda	Visclosky	Wynn
Thompson	Ward	Yates

## NOT VOTING—7

Chapman	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Fields (LA)	Tucker	
Goodling	Volkmer	

## □ 1530

So the motion to table was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on  
the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed rollcall vote 737 on the motion to table. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just tabled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

## □ 1530

## THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 24, 1995, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2491.

## □ 1532

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, with Mr. BOEHNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 24, 1995, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 90 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] be allowed to control the first 30 minutes of debate on our side, and have the author-

ity to yield to other Members, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] be allowed to control the following 10 minutes and have the authority to yield to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes to begin.

Mr. Chairman, in a way, it almost seems anticlimactic to be on the floor today to talk about the most sweeping amount of change that we have seen in this country over the last 60 years. I want to kind of go back and set the foundation for this. Frankly, we have to go back all the way before the last election. The reason why it is important to go back there is it is all about promises made and promises kept.

My colleagues may recall that the Republican majority, at the time the Republican minority, has a program called a Contract With America. We laid out a number of things that we wanted to do to reestablish contact with the American people, including cutting the size of the Congress, the congressional staffs, applying the same laws that we pass on the American people to apply to us known as the Shays Act, the line-item veto, and, of course, the balanced budget amendment and family tax relief, designed to eliminate or ease the burden on the tax increase that the American people suffered in 1993.

We said that we would be able to give Americans tax relief; we said we would be able to balance the budget; we said that we would be able to provide for a strengthened national security situation, and we would get all of this accomplished. Then the horror stories started about what this would really mean for Americans.

My colleagues may remember some of the famous memos that were put out that talked about the fact that Republicans could not do it unless they robbed all of these programs.

Well, back last November we won an election, and a lot of it had to do with our Contract With America. Then in December it was said that there is simply no way we can balance the budget and give tax relief and provide for a stronger national defense and make government smaller; it could not be done. Well, last January or February, I came to the floor with a program to pay for the tax cuts, with a program to pay for less of a tax burden on Americans.

People said, "Well, you can do that, John, but you cannot pass a budget resolution that will enact this entire program." I then came back later that spring with the help and support of my colleagues in the Republican Party, and we then laid down a budget resolution that balanced the budget in 7

years, provided the tax relief we promised, brought about a smaller, more focused, more efficient Federal Government, and strengthened national defense.

People said, "Oh, well, we know you can do the budget resolution, that is the easy part. What you will not be able to do is reconciliation where the rubber meets the road."

So, Mr. Chairman, I come here today with a reconciliation bill that in fact keeps our word, provides tax relief to Americans, sharpens the focus of the Federal Government, strengthens national defense, and keeps all of the promises that we were making last fall.

Is it not a great thing in America that a group of elected officials are going to keep their promises? In fact, we are going to balance the budget over 7 years and save the next generation. Mr. Chairman, just to explain a little bit about it, probably the greatest misnomer or the greatest misunderstanding about this proposal, if we listen to the tenor of the debate, is that Federal spending is going to go down in this budget.

Well, let me just put a couple of things in perspective. JFK, John Kennedy, created the first \$100 billion budget in this country, and that occurred in 1962. We created our first \$100 billion budget in 1962. From 1962 to 1995, the Federal budget grew from \$100 billion to \$1.5 trillion in spending per year.

If a person started a business when Christ was on earth, if that person lost \$1 million a day, 7 days a week, he or she would have to lose \$1 million a day, 7 days a week for the next 700 years to create \$1 trillion. Our budget is \$1.5 trillion and our national debt is approaching \$5 trillion, and this November we are going to have to lay down a debt service payment paying interest on our national debt approaching \$25 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, SONNY MONTGOMERY, one of the great gentlemen of this House, came to me almost in a panic saying, "John did you know, \$25 billion in interest payments?"

I say to my colleagues, with the national debt approaching \$5 trillion, the American people, the mothers and fathers, the mothers and fathers in this country know one thing, that if the Federal Government is unable to control its appetite, if we are unable to slow the growth in Federal spending, it is going to eat us alive.

Now, over the last 7 years in Washington, and we will get some charts out here later, we have spent cumulatively on Federal spending \$9.5 trillion. Remember what I said about how long it took to make \$1 trillion? We spent \$9.5 trillion. Over the next 7 years, in an effort to balance the budget, give Americans tax relief, strengthen national defense, shrink the size and scope of government and make it more focused, we are going to go from \$9.5 trillion in spending to \$12.2 trillion in spending.

Federal spending is going up by almost \$3 trillion.

Now, in Washington, they claim that only having a \$3 trillion increase in spending rather than a \$4 trillion increase in spending is a revolution. Frankly, on Main Street in every small town, in every large city in America, a \$3 trillion increase is not a revolution, it is barely an evolution.

The simple fact of the matter is that people who struggle every day in their families or people who struggle every day in their businesses do not view a \$3 trillion as opposed to a \$4 trillion increase something that would be impossible to do. Frankly, they wonder why it goes up so much.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is, we have a rational plan over time to slow the growth in Federal spending, to slow the growth in Federal spending while at the same time giving people some of their money back, so that they can spend it on things that they think are most important.

Do my colleagues know what the bottom line here is today? The bottom line here today is about the pendulum, it is about power, it is about money, and it is about influence. For 30 years we have sent an awful lot of power and an awful lot of money and a lot of influence to this city.

What we are trying to do is, in a commonsense way, bring the pendulum back so that the American people can be entrusted, so that the American people can be empowered, so that the American people can get their money, their power, and their influence back to fix problems and to show true compassion in the communities in which they live across this great country. Our belief is, it does not work best here; it works best when administered with common sense by people who live all across this country in Main Street, USA.

Mr. Chairman and Members, this is clearly a historic vote, a historic opportunity. This is our chance to restore fiscal sanity and to guarantee economic security for this country. If we are up to this job by slowing the growth in Federal spending, if we can live within a \$3 trillion increase rather than a \$4 trillion increase, do we know what? We have made the first down payment on guaranteeing the prosperity of the United States of America for another century. Mr. Chairman, let us pass the reconciliation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] always makes such a nice speech. It is a pleasure to hear him. I get to dreaming when the gentleman speaks, but let us get back to reality, let us get back to reality.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], has the

gentleman read this bill? Has the gentleman read this bill? Has the gentleman from Ohio read the bill?

Mr. KASICH. Yes.

Mr. GIBBONS. When?

Mr. KASICH. Well, we wrote most of it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not read it. He has not read it. Nobody has read it.

I can tell you one thing it does not contain. It does not contain a \$500-per-child tax cut, does it? Does this bill contain a \$500-per-child tax cut? Yes or no. The answer is no.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. No; the gentleman has plenty of time. You have 5 hours.

Mr. KASICH. Well, then, how am I supposed to answer the question?

Mr. GIBBONS. Does it contain a \$500 tax cut?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, very briefly.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman knows that we are going to have a \$500 tax cut. Contained actually in that bill, it is not there, but it is our full intent to do it, and the gentleman understands the purely technical grounds under which we do not have that in there right now.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the first thing we have established is that it does not contain any \$500 tax cut, so anybody that gets up and says that does not know what is in the bill.

Second, 33 percent of all of the children in families under 18 years of age do not get any tax cut of any sort in the Kasich bill, or should I say in the Gingrich reconciliation bill. Thirty-three percent of all of the children in the United States get nothing out of the Kasich-Gingrich bill. Another 10 percent get a minimal amount of the Kasich tax cut for children and families.

The bill is a fraud. There are so many outrages in this bill that it is impossible to state them all, but there are some real principles that everybody ought to understand. Most of the children and families in tax cuts are in upper income families. They get the tax cuts. The lower income families that really need the money, that have really suffered in all of this revolution, do not get a thing out of this bill, not a cotton-pickin' penny out of this bill.

□ 1545

It is obvious that what is happening in this huge reconciliation bill is that the budget balancing is coming on the backs of poor people, of sick people, of children, and of the working poor. The earned income credit, a bipartisan, partial solution to the problems of the working poor, is being decimated in this bill. That is just a part of the problems that are contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have a limited amount of time; and I want to be fair with Members on my side about this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the reconciliation bill will harm average people just to give that huge tax cut to the wealthiest of people in this country. I would just like to point out, in several areas, some 15 million children in this country will be impacted with the welfare cuts that are being made to give that tax cut to the rich and wealthy of this country.

When we look at children who are receiving public assistance or those who are receiving some type of assistance under the welfare program, it punishes a child by denying cash aid when a State drags its feet on paternity establishment. It leaves children holding the bag if the State runs out of Federal money in any given time. It does not assure safe child care for children when their parents work. It allows children to die when in State care, and the only thing the State is required to do is to make notification to the family upon death.

It throws some medically disabled children off SSI because of the bureaucratic technicalities. It denies SSI benefits to children who did not become disabled soon enough. It cuts aid to poor children just to pay the tax cuts to the rich in this country. There is no guarantee of foster care for children who are abused or neglected under the welfare reform package.

Mr. Chairman, welfare reform that we are working on now with the conferees in the Committee on Ways and Means, the House version of that bill is cruel to children in this country. Just to pay for the huge tax cut, the \$245 billion, that we are going to say to 15 million children who live below the poverty threshold in this country, that we are going to take from the children of this nation to give to the rich and wealthy of this Nation.

The bill harms average people—to provide tax cut for the wealthiest. Reconciliation should focus on balancing the budget—not tax cuts for privileged class.

#### WELFARE

The Republicans have chafed at suggestions that their welfare reform bill—H.R. 4—is cruel to children. The truth hurts. Here are just ten examples of the cruel policies embedded in the Republican contract on America.

It punishes the child—until the mother is 18 years old—for being born out-of-wedlock to a young parent—title I. Number of children punished: 70,000.

It punishes a child—for his entire childhood—for the sin of being born to a family on welfare, even though the child didn't ask to be born—title I. Number of children punished: 2.2 million.

It punishes a child—by denying cash aid—when a State drags its feet on paternity establishment—title I. Number of children punished: 3.3 million.

It leaves children holding the bag if the State runs out of Federal money—title I. Number of children punished: ?

It does not assure safe child care for children when their parents work—title I. Number of children punished: 401,600.

It allows children to die while in State care without requiring any State accountability beyond reporting the death—title II. Number of children punished: ?

It throws some medically disabled children off SSI because of bureaucratic technicalities—title IV. Number of children punished: 75,943.

It denies SSI benefits to children who didn't become disabled soon enough—title IV. Number of children punished: 612,800.

There is no guarantee of foster care for children who are abused or neglected—title II. Number of children punished: ?

It cuts aid to poor children to pay for tax cuts for the rich. Number of children punished: 15 million.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

As we go through this debate, I hope we will have an opportunity to talk about some of these issues and hopefully to respond to some of the things that were said here. I just want to respond to two of them.

The gentleman from Florida spoke about the fact that it does not have the \$500 tax cut. He knows full well what is going on here, the fact that the Contract With America, how the tax cut was passed, the fact that the Senate resolution is somewhat different, there is a haircut or a shave in here to reduce the amount.

The bottom line is, and we have been hearing from the other side, that there is a tax cut in here, that it is all going to the rich. We know there is going to be a tax cut in this bill. There is a tax cut. And it is going to be a tax cut that is going to benefit middle America. That is the second thing I wanted to respond to the gentleman from Florida, talking about this is all going to the wealthy.

Look at this. This chart here demonstrates that the vast majority of that goes to those of the income levels between \$30,000 and \$70,000. That is per family. That is not what, in my definition, is the wealthiest Americans.

Those at the very low end get less, yes, because they pay less, considerably less taxes. In fact, in terms of the tax burden, if you are to put this on the basis of where the tax burden goes, the vast majority of this tax relief, percentagewise, goes to those who are paying the least amount of taxes. So it is distributed over income groups by giving more of it to those at the lower end of the scale.

In fact, the top 1 percent of income earners in this country pays 27.5 per-

cent of all the taxes. They do not get anywhere near that amount of the tax relief. The top 10 percent pay 57.5 percent of the tax. They do not get anywhere near that amount of the tax relief.

I hope as we go through this debate we will have the opportunity to realize that what we are talking about is a tax cut that is going to benefit families. It is saying we are not going to take that money out of your pocket, we are going to leave it in your pocket, and maybe the American family can figure out how to spend the money better than we in Washington can. Maybe they can decide what is best for their education, health care, clothing and feeding and housing their families. That is what this tax cut is all about, benefiting the American family.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the gentleman from Ohio talk about keeping promises. Keeping promises is important. So is looking at the content of those promises. If the content is harmful, there is no great honor in keeping misguided promises. That is what is true here today.

Yesterday, this was said on the floor of the Senate:

As much as I want to reduce the size of government, I question spending cuts directed so disproportionately against the elderly, the young, and the infirm.

That did not come from a Democratic Senator. It came from a Republican Senator, ARLEN SPECTER.

There is a great unease in this country about this Republican package. I think it is the source of the low popularity ratings of the Speaker. It is because I think people in this country feel this budget is not so much courageous as it is callous, reducing by \$23 billion the earned income tax credit for working families, having a tax cut. Two-thirds of the tax cut go to those with incomes above \$75,000. That is what the Treasury Department says.

But I want to go beyond those figures, and I want to talk, for example, about SSI for handicapped kids. These are kids with serious handicaps in families that are low, middle and low income, earning \$28,000 and less. Mr. Chairman, this budget eliminates the cash payment for 700,000 families with seriously handicapped kids.

We have to get the budget under control. We have to eliminate this deficit. But I plead, how we do it is also important.

This is a budget that is a callous budget. It deserves to be rejected. I am sure it will be vetoed by the President, and then we will get down to a bipartisan negotiation as to how to turn around the budget deficit in America.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. I am proud, Mr. Chairman, to stand here with my colleagues on one of the most historic days in the last 30 years. We have today begun the process of shifting the very fabric of government from reckless spending and huge deficits toward responsible fiscal policy.

The last time Congress exhibited fiscal responsibility Sam Rayburn was Speaker. He told us something that some have forgotten. He said, "You'll never get mixed up if you simply tell the truth."

In November of 1994 and over the past 10 months, Republicans have been completely honest with the American people. We have told them the truth. The truth is, the Federal Government taxes too much. The truth is, the Government spends too much.

The national debt is nearing \$5 trillion, and if we continue on the course that the Democrats have proposed, the number will reach over \$8 trillion by 2010.

The truth is, the Republicans have the only certified plan to balance the budget. If you want to talk about caring about children, how much can you care about children if you are not willing to change a pattern of spending that will give to each baby born in 1995 over \$187,000 in taxes in their lifetime just for the interest on the debt?

The truth is, the President sent not just one but two budgets to the Hill; and he requested that Congress spend \$200 billion more than it takes in every year.

The truth is, a balanced budget means a lot to Americans and our children, not only because it is the right thing to do but because it sets us on the road to prosperity. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said that a balanced budget will lower interest rates by 2 percent.

On Election Day, we promised we would present a plan to balance the budget; and now we are delivering on that promise. Unlike the President, ladies and gentlemen, we will have no regrets a year from now. By telling the truth to the American people, we are making history, and we are keeping our commitment. We will deliver hope to a Nation that believed it never could happen again.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the reconciliation bill before us today is an affront to American standards of fairness and decency. Of course the American people want to see the deficit reduced, but they do not want to do it by gutting Medicare, Medicaid, the earned income tax credit, child nutrition, student loans, and a host of other valuable Government programs; and they especially do not want to do it while giving huge tax cuts to those who do not need it.

The Democratic staff of the Joint Economic Committee looked into who is likely to get the tax cuts and who is likely to suffer from the presumed cuts the Republicans are proposing. The results are stunning.

The poorest 20 percent of American families, those making \$13,000 a year or less, those whose income represent only 3.5 percent of the total income in this country, will bear one-half the cuts in programs that help people directly. The poorest 20 percent get half the cuts of benefits, and they are going to get no tax cut whatsoever. Instead, they will see their taxes go up because of the change in the earned income tax credit.

Most middle-income American families get a bad deal as well. Some will get a tax cut, but many will lose benefits worth much more. What is going to be left is they are going to be holding the bag when the Medicaid money is no longer available. They get a net cut, if there is a tax cut, in their gross benefits of \$500 a year.

But under the Republican plan for deficit reduction, the richest 20 percent of American families come out way ahead. They are slated to get two-thirds of the tax cuts, and their tax breaks exceed their losses in program benefits. They get fewer program benefit cuts and more of the tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, the shared sacrifice in reducing the deficit would look very different if we had a Democratic plan. I urge Members to oppose the obscene reconciliation package.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to stand here in behalf of my own leadership and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to compliment them for their yeoman work.

I want to share a little bit of a personal vignette that relates to this entire experience. My father served as Governor of Maine, but my father was also a former Democrat. In 1974, he left the Democratic Party because he was sick of the tax-and-spend philosophy and the attitude that there was no limit to what this Government can do.

There is an irony also because in 1976 he was the first national cochairman of the National Committee for a Balanced Budget Amendment. The irony was this: When his son was sworn in as a Member of this Congress, his two grandchildren, my son, Matthew, age 11, and my daughter, age 7, Sarah, were on the floor with me. It made me sick to think that after 20 years my two children were at a point where they are looking at paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes on interest alone on the Federal debt without a single reduction of principal. That is what this is all about.

We have a plan today. There is no plan on the Democratic side. In fact, any plan that has been offered barely gets past any plan that has been of-

fered by our own leadership, barely passes the muster of your own caucus.

I have got another little secret to share with your today. Last November, the Republicans took control of the Congress by 13 seats. In that freshman class we have 14 former Democrats, myself included, who are sick of the tax-and-spend attitude that has been pushed.

The issue is, are we going to do it or not? Are we finally going to bite the bullet and pass a plan that gets us on a track to a balanced budget or are we going to continue the game, the charades, and the lack of honesty about an issue that is fundamental to the future of this country, including the future of my two children?

□ 1600

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I love all of this ethereal talk about the wonder-land that is being created by our Republican colleagues.

But when are we going to get down to business? When are we going to talk about what is in this monstrous bill they have got here? Let me just ask the gentleman on the other side if they can explain any of the language on pages 1296 and 1297? Just pick it up and read it, and if you can explain it, take your time and try to do it.

But, you know, that is what this debate is about. It is not about dreams. It is about reality. It is what is contained in here, and this is a bill that is going to be vetoed. It deserves to be vetoed. Then perhaps we can talk some common sense around here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, the former speaker, I say, yes, we know you are going to do it, pass this bill. But it is the way you do it that we have the problem with.

I stand here in opposition to the part of this bill, the earned income tax credit, which is under attack. This is the one feature of the Tax Code generally designed to help working families. The majority side's runaway growth is justification for taking away \$23 billion from the earned income tax credit. This claim conveniently ignores the fact that this is the way the law was written on purpose.

President Reagan supported the earned income tax credit. President Bush expanded it, and then President Clinton embraced it, and that is where we are today: Working people get a tax credit.

The majority goes on to great lengths to point out that families with too much income are receiving this credit and uses this as the primary justification for phasing out the credit. However, the majority well knows the very structure of the credit results in families with incomes above the poverty line receiving the credit. Destruction of the credit so a family would



lose the entire working credit for earning 1 additional dollar above the base amount would destroy the work incentive.

Therefore, to phase out the credit faster, the majority raises the marginal rate on every family. This change is nothing less than \$8.7 billion tax relief on the 9.4 million families with children, earning between \$11,000 and \$28,000.

This is really beyond the beyond, and I do not see how anybody can defend it. This is an egregious example of paying for tax breaks by raising taxes on some of America's most hard-working families.

The tax credit was the first effort of bipartisanship to keep working families working, and then it was the first step in welfare reform, and now to attack it and say it does not work, it works. You need the \$23 billion, but it should not be taken from the tax credit.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I think something is important to put into perspective. If we choose to allow this Government to run on the course it is currently taking, in 17 short years every single dollar that every individual taxpayer sends to this town, every tax dollar paid by every corporation in America will all be consumed by just five programs: Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Federal Employee Retirement Benefits, and the interest payment on the national debt. In just 17 short years we will not be talking about possible reductions in student financial assistance that will allow a child to help get to college. There will simply be no money available to help send children to college, because all of our tax revenues will be consumed by those five mandatory entitlement spending programs.

If we need to help put police on the streets in our neighborhoods that are high-crime areas, the Federal Government will be unable to help any of those communities, because all of our available revenue will be consumed by just those five programs.

If you are concerned about the quality of our air and our water, there will not be any Environmental Protection Agency, because all of the money will have been consumed by just those five mandatory entitlement spending programs; no money for infrastructure, for our roads, our bridges, our highways, our mass transit systems.

The bottom line is that the next generation will inherit an America with far fewer opportunities because the Government will have taken all of its available revenue, yet still be unable to meet some compelling needs of our citizens.

For 30 years, we have been deficit spending. We have lost sight of our fundamental responsibilities to make certain that we measure our commitment

to compassion with our ability to sustain programs financially.

It has gotten out of balance. Ladies and gentlemen, this is the hour to balance the budget.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate my Republican friends for making a promise and keeping it. People did not understand the contract. I did. I have known you for along time.

You said you were going to reduce the deficit. You said you were going to balance the budget. I knew darn well what you meant. You meant you were going to give back some taxes, tax cuts, because I understand what you were talking about.

If you give more money to the rich, they are smart enough to know what to do with it. They are going to invest it. Right? That is why most of it goes to rich people. They invest it, create jobs, and sooner or later, 10 or 15 years, it trickles down, the poor get something. I understand what you are talking about.

You say you want to help people with health care. The best way to help old folks with health care is take away what they have got, so you take away \$270 billion, give them a voucher, and tell them, "You are sick. Go out and find yourself a health maintenance program."

The previous speaker said we would not have money to fight crime. That is the cruelest thing of all, because you cut education, you cut job training, you cut the little cushion we have in the earned income tax credit to keep people working instead of having to go on welfare. And so what do we have in our cities that really cost us, not just in losing deficit but in losing lives, is that instead of giving job opportunities, you give us jails, instead of talking about having schools and educators and going into partnership, you allow drugs to come and provide the hope.

Let me say this, yes, you balanced the budget. Yes, you give the tax cut. But when you said you were reforming these programs, believe me, the American people can read the fine print in that contract.

You may have fulfilled the goal as you read it, but if you go to Catholic Charities, if you go to the Jewish Council Against Poverty, if you go to the Protestant Council, those people who provide the health care and try to help the poor among us, they will tell you you breached that contract with the American people and sooner or later when they come back you will soon know that America would not tolerate what you are doing to them today. They will pay you back tomorrow.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, again to the total Federal spending, it is going from \$9.5 trillion to \$12.2 trillion. We want it to go up.

I mean, it is almost absurd to argue this because it shows you how modest we are being. We want it to go from \$9.5 trillion to \$12.1 trillion; total Federal spending will grow like this.

What do the big spenders want? They want to grow at \$13.3 trillion. If we keep doing this, the country is going bankrupt.

You want to talk about kids? They will have no chance. You want to talk about the rich? The rich will get richer and the poor will get poorer.

The fact is our Federal spending goes up.

Let us talk about the rest of the program. Medicare, we are going to go from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion. If we grow at \$1.8 trillion, guess what, Medicare goes bankrupt. We had that debate last week, and our senior citizens are going to be in wonderful shape if they want to stay in the current program, and, frankly, they ought to look at the private plans where they are going to get more.

But under any circumstance, Medicare grows from \$926 billion to \$1.6 trillion.

Now Medicaid, to listen to the other side, you would think we are going down. Medicaid is going from \$443 billion, you hear those numbers out there on main street, billion, to \$773 billion. The big spenders want to go to \$955 billion. Of course, the country will go bankrupt.

But it does not make for a good speech to talk about facts.

Welfare reform, in our welfare program, we are going to go from \$492 billion to \$838 billion. Some want it to grow to \$949 billion.

If we do this, you know what will happen. The country will go bankrupt.

The bottom line is, folks, can we, in fact, grow from \$9.5 trillion to \$12.1 trillion? Can we restrain ourselves from that extra trillion dollars? If we restrain ourselves, we will balance the budget. We will give tax relief, and the earned income tax credit is going to go up 40 percent under our plan. I think that is pretty good, a 40-percent increase over the next 7 years, and nobody will get less money in 1996 than they got in 1995.

These are the facts. This is what will save the country. Pass this reconciliation bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I always love the beautiful dreaming charts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. He overlooks two factors. One, the country as a whole grows in total number of people, as does the eligible population, for the types of things he was castigating.

Second, there is the impact of inflation that unfortunately is with us and has been with us for, well, for generations, really. So all of his figures are just make-believe.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to a budget reconciliation package that violates every concept of truth in labeling and truth in advertising. If you believe this reconciliation bill is about balancing the budget and keeping promises, you believe Joe Camel was created to teach children about dangers of smoking.

The problems with this bill begin with the numerous horrendous provisions that betray the middle class, working Americans who pull the wagon. The attack on the middle class is broad and bold. This bill opens the door to those who would raid pension funds and put at risk the retirement benefits of working Americans. At the same time, it closes the door to higher education for millions of Americans by restricting access to student loans.

Elderly Americans also face a double-barreled attack. Two hundred seventy billion dollars of Medicare cuts threaten the availability and affordability of basic medical care. Another \$180 billion of cuts in Medicaid will tear at the family budgets of millions of elderly Americans, and their children, who are trying to cope with the costs of nursing care.

The promises broken in this bill are far too many to mention in just a few minutes. But one deserves special attention. The promise of the Contract With America—in the Speaker's term, the crown jewel—was a \$500-per-child tax credit. Under the bill before us today, the crown jewels have been devalued by 27 percent. This bill walks away from that promise and many more. But the bill does preserve the spirit of the contract in one important way—the elderly, the middle class, and the poor bear the burden of paying for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit wealthy taxpayers.

There will be an opportunity tomorrow to vote for a plan that will balance the budget in 7 years. We can vote for a plan that will borrow less money than the Republican plan, that will balance the budget without tax increases, and that does not require the harsh and unwise cuts proposed by the Republican budget.

I refer to the coalition budget. That substitute demonstrates you can balance the budget in 7 years without the extreme proposals of the Republicans, with less borrowing, if you only will give up the special-interest tax breaks that are included in the Republican bill.

□ 1615

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, it was Robert Kennedy who said that progress is a nice word, but change is its motivator, and change has its enemies.

It should come as no surprise to anybody that our plan of change, that represents the most significant change within the Federal Government in the last 60 years, a truly historic vote that will occur on this floor tomorrow, has its enemies. That should come as no surprise.

We have the defenders of the status quo, that have said we need to spend more and more and more, and continue to load the debt on to our children and our grandchildren, arguing against this plan. In fact, I would submit to Members that had our plan come from on high on tablets of stone, that these same people would be voicing their opposition to these extreme measures that the Republican plan puts forth in the reconciliation bill.

Yes, change is difficult, but change is absolutely necessary. We cannot continue to add more and more debt on to the heads of our children and grandchildren. We cannot allow Medicare to go bankrupt. We cannot continue to overtax our families and our businesses. We cannot continue to allow government to grow and grow and grow.

No, Mr. Chairman, it is time to resist the enemies of change, to be courageous, something that has been lacking in Washington, DC for too long; to do the right thing, for our country and for our children.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that if this bill had come down from on high, our good Lord would not be doing to the poor, sick, and disabled of this country what is in this bill.

We went through a charade here last week to convince the American people that there was no connection between Medicare and the tax cuts. We had speaker after speaker saying no, we are doing one this week, and we are doing one the next week, and there is no connection.

But if you take this bill, 724 pages, go to page 1324, and it says "H.R. 2425 as passed by the House of Representatives is hereby enacted into law." Medicare is mixed in with the tax breaks. Now, that is the essence of what this bill is all about.

There is no question that the Republican revolution is intended to give 1 percent of Americans who make more than \$200,000 annually a tax cut that averages \$12,600. But if you are in the 19 percent of the families in this country earning less than \$10,000, you will have a tax increase of \$25 a year. More than half of the cuts, 52 percent, go to 5.6 percent of the Americans at the top of the schedule.

Now, at the same time, this bill takes \$23 billion and puts it as a tax increase on the low-income families in this country who are trying to stay off welfare. These families will be hit doubly hard, first by the \$23 billion cut in

the earned income tax credit, and second by the complete or partial ineligibility they have for the nonrefundable \$500 tax cut.

We also see in this bill a paltry \$2 billion taken out of corporate welfare in this country. The question is, why are the poor people hit 11 times harder than the corporations of this country?

It is a bad bill. I urge Members to vote against it. It means that we are going to balance the budget on the backs of the poor, and that is wrong. I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], God would not have done that.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, do you know what the fastest growing area of the Republican budget is? It is Medicare. We are taking care of older Americans. The rhetoric on the other side is that we are taking care of the rich. Is the family tax credit taking care of the rich? Is giving breaks for working families through an adoption tax credit taking care of the rich? Is giving families the ability to use an IRA for first-time home buying, for health care expenses, to encourage savings, is that taking care of the rich? I think not.

Let us call this what it is. Inherent in this question is the moral question of what type of world we will leave to the children of America.

There can be no serious question as to the two paths before us. We can stay on the path we have been on and deliver a future of unsustainable spending and crushing debt, huge increases in taxes that dash hopes and dreams, and in the end that promise fewer opportunities and a poorer quality of life for the smallest among us, who, incidentally, do not have the ability to vote.

Or we can take another path, a brighter path. It will require courage, but it represents the hopes and the aspirations of every parent for every child in America. It promises an America where our children can have better lives than we. It will make America stronger for our generation, for our children's generation, and for generations to come. It maps out a positive future for our country by beginning the tough task of balancing the Federal budget and beginning to pay off our national debt.

With the national debt approaching \$5 trillion and expected to reach almost \$8 trillion by 2010, and interested payments scheduled to surpass the money we now spend on our national defense, now is not the time for our political needs to buckle. A balanced budget is the surest strategy to increase American productivity and living standards. That is not according to some Republican rhetoric, that is according to Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. A balanced budget

means 6 million new jobs, rising family income, making homes, cars, education, or starting a new business more affordable.

If we cave into 30-second sound bites, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to do the right thing because we do not agree with every single change that has been made in this pivotal package, will fail to do the right thing for our children.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, well, here we go again. Fifteen years after George Bush warned this Nation about voodoo economics, our friends on the other side of the aisle are up to their old tricks again. They are trying to tell the American people that a 7 year \$245 billion tax cut is an important step along the road to a balanced budget.

This time, the American people know better. They know that to cut taxes by \$245 billion, when you are \$5 trillion in debt and when you are experiencing deficits of more than \$160 billion annually, is not just bad economics, it also runs against simple common sense. It may please some, but it is bad public policy.

There is a better, more fiscally responsible course for us to follow. It will be on the floor tomorrow. This is a budget written by our Conservative Democratic Coalition, which takes this Nation straight to a balanced budget by the year 2002, and it does so without these costly tax cuts. It contains real budget reforms, and it cuts the budget faster and deeper than the Republican plan. Because our bill rejects tax cuts, it provides a more moderate glide path to the balanced budget.

We assure the solvency of the Medicare Program, but we do it fairly. Medicare will receive \$100 billion more than the Republican plan. Medicaid will receive \$100 billion more. The vulnerable rural hospitals in my district and elsewhere so dependent on Medicare and Medicaid will receive fair reimbursements under our program. We reject deep cuts in student loan programs, retain the earned income tax credit, and provide \$80 billion more in discretionary spending in the areas ranging from education to economic development, to agriculture and to conservation.

Mr. Chairman, let us reject this business as usual. We can and we should not cut taxes when we have to borrow this money from our children. Vote tomorrow for the Conservative Democratic Coalition alternative. Vote against the Republican reconciliation bill.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to one thing said by the last speaker, and that is the implication of deep cuts in student loans.

That is just simply not true. Mr. Chairman, we are not cutting student loans. Student loans, the Pell grants are going to grow; there are going to be a higher amount of Pell grants than before. The total amount of student loans is going to grow. The only thing we are doing is saying when you graduate in college in the 6 months that the taxpayer, the working Americans, single parents and mothers, are subsidizing that loan, we are saying they are going to pay the interest. They are going to accumulate the interest for that 6 months. That is the only difference. That is the only change we are making.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I will start with a quote that I would like to bring to your attention: It goes as follows:

We have no right, frankly, to continue to finance a Government budget that is 20 percent debt-financed, and will be more debt-financed in the years ahead, and leave it to our children to figure out how to live with lower incomes than they otherwise would have. And believe me, it isn't just our children. We're going to be living with the consequence in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, that is not NEWT GINGRICH, our Speaker. That is not DICK ARMEY. That is not our chairman, JOHN KASICH. In fact, it is not even you, Mr. Chairman. That is President Bill Clinton in 1993 talking about the budget.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I have 2 children, Lucy and Jonathan, ages 2 and 4. They owe the Federal Government today over \$18,000. As has been said before, if we do nothing, in their lifetimes they could owe as much as \$180,000. I am not going to leave this country to that kind of a destiny. The future of this country is indeed in our hands today, and indeed, one could say, the world.

Now, this reconciliation package is not perfect. There are problems with it. There are problems with any document that is developed as a result of consensus. But what is at stake today is the very institution of this Government and the country. We have spent beyond our means now for over 30 years, and if we fail to get this country on a path to a balanced budget starting today, I do not know where my children, Jonathan and Lucy, are going to be 20 years, from now.

Mr. Chairman, when all the rhetoric does down, the shrill rhetoric and Chicken Little discussion about how the sky is falling in is over, the American people will remember this Congress for many, many years after the rest of us are gone.

Please join me today in passing this reconciliation package. It is needed.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, the prior speaker, said that this reconciliation proposal is not perfect. The gentleman is correct, and when imperfections are raised, the Members of this body should try to do something about it before Members are going to be asked to vote on it. I will give you one example: It is the pension reversion issue. Many of you know about it. Some do not know about it. You better get to know about it soon, because it is going to hit you in the first 6 months of 1996.

If you recall, in the eighties we had massive withdrawals of pension funds by companies, companies that were basically in trouble, \$20 billion, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation had to take over a lot of these pension programs. What we did in 1986, 1988, and 1990 under Reagan and Bush, on a bipartisan basis, is clean it up. So there is now an excise tax of 50 percent if you take pension fund moneys out of these pension programs, unless it goes to health care benefits for your retirees.

What the Committee on Ways and Means did, what the majority did, was put a provision in to allow companies to take money out of their pension funds without any restraint. They can use the money not only for health care, but they can use it to buy luxury cars, they can take the money out for bonuses for their executive employees, they can take the money out for leveraged buyouts.

In fact, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which is a non-partisan group, says that over \$40 billion will be taken out of this fund over the next couple of years, probably in the first 6 months of 1996, when all of us are going to feel it, mainly because there is an incentive. There is no excise taxes for the first 6 months of 1996.

This is a provision that is going to do major damage to the average American worker, and this is a provision that is strictly special interest. We received reports written by companies that were special interests that basically supported this provision, but all objective outside groups have said this is going to do major damage, major damage, to the average American worker. I would just be aware of this, because we are going to feel this in the first 6 months of 1996.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I think the question is to this side of the aisle, to the American people, do we want to balance this budget, or do we not? The American people are not too concerned about how we keep our books, but let me just make a couple of comments why it is so important to the American family, to our kids, and our grandkids.

If you had a stack of \$1,000 bills pushed tightly together, \$1 million

would be 4 inches high. Our debt in this country is over 300 miles into outer space of tightly stacked \$1,000 bills. Government has got its arm in the pot of available money that can be lent out in this country to the tune of borrowing 40 percent of all of the money lent out last year.

What does that mean as far as demand goes? Alan Greenspan, our top banker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, says if we could end up with a balanced budget we would see a 1.5 to 2 percent lower interest rate. What do you think that means to somebody that is paying off a college loan?

□ 1630

I will tell Members what it means. It means on the average an individual would save \$2,000 over the payback period of their loan. What does it mean to a family paying off a \$100,000 home that they are buying on that mortgage? It means a \$2,000 savings. It means that we are going to expand jobs and the economy in this country.

The President sent us a budget. CBO says it is never going to balance. And yet right now, in his press conference, the President is announcing that with the growth in the economy we probably would not have to have any spending cuts.

Mr. Chairman, just let me finish by saying back in 1947 the Federal Government operated on 12 percent of the GDP. We used 12 percent of the GDP to operate this place. We know what it is now. It is almost double that. We have expanded this Government, spending 22 percent of our gross domestic product.

If we care about our kids and our grandkids, let us get back in focus, let us balance this budget.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill is really not a reconciliation bill, it is a wrecker ball bill on middle class families.

Mr. Chairman, an ugly spirit has risen in our Nation's Capital. A mean spirit. A cruel spirit. A spirit that gave rise to this Republican bill.

Republicans raise taxes on the working poor—and cut taxes for the idle rich. Republicans raise taxes on 30 million working families.

Republicans spend more on defense, but cut Head Start, school lunches, and student loans. They choose bombers over babies, defense contractors over children, star wars over schools.

Do you really want a welfare bill that would put children in orphanages? Do you want to return to the days when families put the disabled in back rooms. Do you want to send senior citizens to dilapidated hospitals and second rate medical care?

I cannot believe, I truly cannot believe what this bill does to our country. There are Americans who need our help. Children do not choose to go hungry. The elderly do not choose to become sick. The handicapped do not choose to be disabled.

Mr. colleagues—there, but for the grace of God, go I. Each and every Member of this body is blessed. We have a responsibility—a moral obligation—to do right by our children, our seniors, and our working families. This bill fails that test.

Two hundred and forty-five billion dollars can help a lot of families earn a livable wage. It can feed a lot of children. It can help a lot of students get through school. It can provide medical care for hundreds of thousands of seniors. With \$245 billion, you can do a lot of good for a lot of people.

Or you can squander it on a privileged few. You can pay for a tax cut for rich, political friends. That is the choice you make today. I urge you to look within your heart—to do what is right. Vote “no” on this proposal. It is cruel, it is mean, it is downright low-down.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

(Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor with a great deal of pride today. We can and should take pride in the fact that for the first time in a very long time the House of Representatives is going to do what is right for the future of this great Nation—we are balancing the budget.

We will pass this balanced budget and set the country's finances back on the right path for the first time since 1969. It is a vote for the future and a vote for our children and grandchildren.

We are stemming the flow of red ink from the Federal Treasury so that my 28 grandchildren won't be stuck with bills run up by their grandfather's generation.

I am also proud of the fact that we listened to the American people and we are doing what we promised to do. We are delivering on the change that the people want.

The people want welfare reform; and, we are delivering. The people want tax relief; and, we are delivering. The people want us to save Medicare from going bankrupt; and, we are delivering. The people want more power returned to the States; and, we are delivering.

The baby boomers will be retiring soon and that means that they will be looking for Social Security and Medicare benefits. This budget helps to ensure that those benefits will be there when they need them.

This is a good budget. For a change, it shows that we can keep our promises and it shows the American people that we listened to what they want instead of acting like the national nanny.

There are many in this House who do not like the new way of doing things. But, I am willing to bet that the American people like knowing that we are doing things their way, for a change.

My friends, this is the opportunity to fulfill the vision that President Reagan

set forth in his first inaugural address when he said:

It is not my intention to do away with government. It is rather to make it work—work with us, not over us; stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it.

This budget meets the Reagan goals. We must pass it. We must show the American people that we can and will deliver the change that they want.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for yielding me the time. We have heard a lot of talk today about deficit reduction and, clearly, this bill is intended to do that. But as we talk about, like the former speaker, about reducing the deficit, very few of my Republican colleagues tell us how they are doing this.

We spent 1 day of debate last week talking about the Medicare cuts that are embodied in this bill. Also embodied in this bill are substantial tax cuts. Now, my friends, if we are trying to resolve a budget deficit and we have no money, where, I ask my colleagues, are the dollars coming from to fund a tax cut, one which, I have to tell Members, is purportedly going to the middle class.

Well, my Republican friends have a new definition of Republican middle class. I will share that with Members. Here is a quote from one of the Republican Members of the House, and he indicates “When I see someone who is making anywhere from \$300,000 a year to \$750,000 a year, that is middle class. When I see anyone above that, that is upper middle class.” I think this indicates to us where the tax cuts are going and where this whole deficit reduction bill is going.

Mr. Chairman, I specifically want to address an issue which I think is very, very important to the working men and women of this country. My friend, the gentleman from California, BOB MATSUI, talked about this before. In this bill there is a provision which will permit corporations to raid their pension plans to the tune of \$40 billion. Corporations under this bill can take out of their pension plans, which is put there by workers, reserved for their workers' pension. This bill says they can take up to about \$40 billion out of that nationwide.

The problem with that policy, Mr. Chairman, is who will pick up the tab if these pension plans cannot meet their obligations? We have an answer. It is called the Pension Guaranty Corporation, a Federal agency ensuring pension plans. But they have their financial problems on their own even without this. So I say, and my other colleagues will say to Members, this will end up another savings and loan bailout. Because if the Pension Guaranty Corporation does not have the money after the corporation is

skimmed \$40 billion, it is the taxpayers who will have to shell out the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds all Members that they should direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the audience or anyone else outside of the Chamber.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, the national debt now stands at \$4.8 trillion, and this means that a child who is born today is going to have to pay \$180,000 just to pay the interest on the debt over their lifetime. That is \$3,500 in taxes every year of their working life. We are literally mortgaging our children's future and straddling them with a mountain of debt.

As a mother of five and grandmother of six, almost seven, I have a moral obligation to balance this budget for them because I want my kids and grandkids to have a better future, to have more opportunity than I have. But, how can that happen if they start out with this great mountain of debt on their backs?

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated if we balance the budget, interest rates will drop 2 percent. Now, that may not sound like a lot, but just consider the fact that that means, on a 30-year mortgage on a \$75,000 house, an individual would save \$37,000. That is enough to put our kids through college. It also means that an individual would save \$900 on a \$15,000 car loan. My goodness, look at what that would mean to a young person starting out or a young couple.

Mr. Chairman, the family is the most important part of society in America today and a balanced budget is good for the American family. On behalf of our children and our children's children we need to vote for a balanced budget and to do that so we will be sure that tomorrow's dream, the American dream, does not turn into tomorrow's nightmare.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I stand here before you today to oppose this budget reconciliation package. We are beginning this historic debate on the future direction of our country. This budget heads the country in the wrong direction. It is a shame that we could not be here today debating a bipartisan budget which has a sole purpose of meaningful deficit reduction.

This budget harms the American people. The Medicare cuts totaling \$270 billion go too far. These extreme cuts are needed in order to pay for \$245 billion in tax cuts to wealthy Americans. We debated this tax cut back in the spring and I still believe it is not needed.

I have been traveling throughout my district and I have heard angry com-

plaints about other aspects of this budget. Seniors are scared about drastic cuts to Medicare. They fear what will happen to them if they are struck with a catastrophic illness.

College students are afraid about the changes to student loans. Will they be able to afford to finish college? Parents are afraid they will not be able to pay for the college tuition of their children.

Individuals who have worked their way off of welfare are angry about changes to the earned income tax credit. The EITC has been an extremely successful incentive for work. Even President Reagan was supportive of the EITC. In 1986, he stated that EITC was "the best anti-poverty, the best pro-family, the best job-creation measure to come out of Congress."

Hard-working Americans do not understand the corporate pension reversion provision. Why should corporations be allowed to raid pension plans? I look at this provision and all I can see is the ghost of the S&L crisis. How do we explain this onerous provision to the American people? We cannot light a match to the pension funds of hard-working individuals.

The Citizens For Tax Justice's analysis of the tax cuts included in this reconciliation package indicates that 52.3 percent of the tax cuts go to 5.6 percent of Americans with incomes greater than \$100,000 a year. Less than 1 percent of these tax cuts would go to the 40 percent of families earning \$20,000 or less per year.

This budget heads the country in the wrong direction. We need to be responsible legislators. This legislation is not responsible. I urge you to vote against budget reconciliation.

We owe the American people more than this budget. It is our obligation to do better.

□ 1645

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOEHNER). All time has expired. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously agreed to, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is an historic occasion as we get ready to vote on the budget reconciliation bill tomorrow. For those of us who have worked so hard to get to this point, it really is exciting.

Mr. Chairman, we have made some difficult choices getting to this point today, but I look at this as a moral issue that we are fighting today. Just as our parents and grandparents fought the war against fascism, and we recently had the war against communism, we won those; the moral fight we are having today is about balancing this budget. It is a moral issue. It is obscene what we are doing by overspending in the Federal Government by over \$600 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Today, the national debt is \$18,800 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and is getting larger and larger every year.

We are spending more money on interest on the national debt than we do for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and the CIA combined. The greatest threat we have to all the good programs in this Government, like Medicare or Head Start, the threat is interest on the national debt. If we do not get that under control, we are going to make the future generations pay dearly.

Mr. Chairman, it only makes sense to balance our budget. I was home this weekend and talked to a city councilman from Venice, FL, and a city commissioner from Sarasota, and county commissioners and State legislators. They have to balance their budget. Everybody understands that. Why do we not understand it in Washington?

All we want to do is balance the Federal budget. It makes sense. No one can argue with that. We argue about all this we are cutting; we are increasing spending and we are doing it for the kids and the future generations.

Mr. Chairman, the cruelest thing we can do is to continue to overspend and leave this horrible debt with our kids and our future generations. We must pass this budget reconciliation tomorrow.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I think we are going to give our colleagues a break and change the topic of the conversation around here because, frankly, the folks over to my right and my friends on the Republican side are right, and the folks to my left who have been discussing that budget are right.

The fact is, the reconciliation bill that the Republicans have presented does try to balance the budget by 2002. But the folks over here are right too, in that it goes too far.

Mr. Chairman, what we would like to do is take a few minutes and have a few of our colleagues talk about an alternative budget, an alternative reconciliation plan that was prepared by the coalition. We think that our alternative plan is better than what has been offered by the Republicans, because it achieves balance by the year 2002, as the Republicans' plan does, but ours does it in a way that is more responsible. It accumulates less debt for our Nation over that period, and it is fairer to the people such as senior citizens, farmers, and students and other people that we think the plan should be fair to.

What I would like to do is recognize a few of our coalition members, and a few Members of Congress who are not coalition members, to talk about the coalition budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

(Mr. BREWSTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be speaking on the House floor today in what I feel is an historic debate. This Congress is finally considering plans to balance our Nation's budget in 7 years, and I think we should all be proud of that.

However, there are two plans that will be considered tomorrow that will achieve a balanced budget and I feel the coalition alternative is the most fair and honest approach to this goal.

The coalition budget reconciliation is a responsible budget alternative that meets all the deficit reduction requirements for a balanced budget by 2002.

In order to balance the budget, we must all support some cuts in valuable programs. However, cutting programs fairly and gutting them are two totally different alternatives. The coalition budget is much kinder on many programs important to all Americans than the Republican budget reconciliation.

First, we make no cuts in guaranteed student loans. The coalition understands the importance of education and will not make it more expensive for middle- and low-income families to obtain college loans like the Republican bill.

The coalition budget cuts \$80 billion less from education, Head Start, rural health care, and economic development than the Republican bill. And, we cut \$10 billion less from agriculture programs, preserving agriculture subsidies in a way that doesn't unilaterally disarm American farmers in a global marketplace.

We cut \$100 billion less from Medicare coverage for our Nation's seniors than the Republican budget. We cut \$100 billion less from Medicaid than the Republican bill. And, in addition to that, we accumulate much less debt than the Republican plan over 7 years, because we set a more responsible glidepath.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute reaches the same goal as the Republican budget—a balanced budget by 2002. And, yet the coalition substitute provides more money for those in need.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not you support tax cuts is not the issue today. Many of us in the coalition support tax cuts, however, we firmly believe you ought to cut spending first before you give the money out for tax cuts.

The coalition alternative also rewards work with a welfare plan that, according to the CBO, will put more people to work than the Republican plan. We preserve the earned income tax credit to reward those who are working to stay off welfare rolls. The Republican plan would cut drastically from this valuable work program.

Mr. Chairman, this alternative is the only reasonable solution to putting our Nation's fiscal house in order. The people of this country have asked us to do this, and I think this plan achieves that goal more quickly, and less painfully than the Republican plan. I urge my colleagues to take a long, hard, look at the coalition's alternative and

vote for the coalition budget reconciliation substitute tomorrow.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of scare tactics here on the floor today about the pension reversion issue that is a part of this bill. Let me tell my colleagues that we should be interested in strengthening pension plans in this country.

Over the last 5 years, there have been no new defined benefit plans created in the United States of America. Many have been frozen or terminated. It is because of the very unwise policy that this country has conducted toward pension plans over the last 10 to 12 years.

Mr. Chairman, this bill turns that around. It includes pension simplification, and, yes, it includes the ability of employers to withdraw excess funding above 125 percent, of liability.

ERISA only requires that employers keep 100 percent of liability in the fund to qualify. But if they get 125 percent, they still cannot withdraw any of those funds. As a result, employers are not going to fund extra above the 100 percent, because they know they can never get their money back if they get above 125 percent.

Mr. Chairman, our bill encourages employers to fund more in the marginal plans, and that is what we should be doing. If ERISA was inadequate in having plans qualify with only 100 percent of accrued liability, ERISA needs to be changed. The plans that are vulnerable in the event of a decline in the market are the plans that are 90 to 100 percent, but which qualify under ERISA, not the plans that are funded above 125 percent of liability.

So, Mr. Chairman, we constructively and proudly move forward with this bill to encourage more defined benefit plans, adequately funded.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the coalition's alternative budget for a minute, because on the floor earlier today there was a statement made that the Republicans had the only budget reconciliation plan that got to a balance in 2002. That simply is not the case.

Mr. Chairman, the coalition plan cuts spending first. We get to a balanced budget in 2002, borrowing about \$50 billion less than the Republican plan will borrow between now and then.

Mr. Chairman, we do something else that is responsible, fair, and wise. We send a signal to the military veterans of our country that we are going to keep their commitment. Our values are to keep the commitment from a grateful country to our Nation's veterans and we have military retiree subvention, so that they can use their

Medicare at military hospitals or any other facilities they so desire.

The important point to come out of this debate over the next 2 days, Mr. Chairman, is that our coalition budget gets to balance in 2002, in a more responsible, fair, and wise manner than does the Republican plan.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], a member of both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget, and the great catcher for the Republican baseball team.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, today we have embarked on a truly historic debate that will ultimately culminate in the passage of the first balanced budget in over a quarter of a century.

Mr. Chairman, the American voters sent Members of this Congress here to Washington to change business as usual and put our national fiscal house in order. Mr. Chairman, the American people understand how to balance a budget. They do it every day. Unlike Washington, small business owners have to meet budgets and payrolls or they will go out of business.

Local governments have to live within their means. Mr. Chairman, families across this Nation sit around their kitchen tables every month to figure out how to provide shelter, food, and clothing for their families with only the money they currently have. Indeed, the American people know how to balance a budget and, Mr. Chairman, it is time that Washington does the same.

Yet, ironically, the Americans that will benefit the most from this balanced budget are not even old enough to vote: our children.

Mr. Chairman, it is morally wrong to ask future generations to pay for the current excessive expenditures. For example, past spending has left a \$5 trillion legacy for a child born today, which faces \$187,000 in taxes just to pay their inherited share of interest on the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, the budget before us today is a fair one. It puts an end to frivolous expenditures by finally prioritizing spending and making the tough choices that previous Congresses refused to make.

Mr. Chairman, it is our moral obligation to pass this historic balanced budget.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], an outstanding coalition member.

(Mrs. LINCOLN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, there is a saying: Be careful what you wish for, because you may get it. I think as the Republicans embarked on this idea of balancing the budget, and under the auspices of balancing the budget presented this package, they thought there would not be any Democrats that actually honestly wanted to balance the budget.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there are. We have worked hard at coming up with a responsible, fair package that will actually do that. There is an old southern saying that, there is more than one way to skin a cat, and I think that is exactly what we have done.

Mr. Chairman, we have addressed agriculture here. We do not unilaterally disarm American farmers in a global agricultural marketplace where other nations are subsidizing far more than we are, and we are working hard to balance the budget on behalf of our children and our children's children. But, we also recognize that they need educational opportunities to be competitive in a global marketplace. We not only balance the budget for our children, but we give them the capability and the resources they need to be able to be independent and productive for themselves in years to come.

□ 1700

This is a fair, reasonable, and wise approach to making sure that we do balance the budget. We look at all aspects of it and do it in a fair way.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from the State of Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, let me first pay my respects to my blue dog Democratic friends and acknowledge the effort they have made in presenting an alternative budget for us today. The fact that there is a second budget, which does promise us a balanced budget in 7 years, is encouraging.

Let me also congratulate the President for saying that he, too, believes that we can do this thing in 7 years and end this terrible debt we are creating for our children by balancing our budget over 7 years. Let me also acknowledge the fact that the President admitted that maybe he did raise taxes too much last Congress.

For all of my colleagues who believe that in this choice between the Republican balanced budget, which includes the capacity to reduce the tax burdens on Americans and the balanced budget proposed by my friends, the blue dog Democrats, let me suggest to them something: If my colleagues oppose those tax increases the President now regrets, if Members opposed that bill last year, then they ought to be for the Republican budget which promises that we are at least going to repeal about two-thirds of those awful tax increases that my colleague opposed last Congress.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUZIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman say that again?

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to say it again. If anyone in this House voted against that tax increase bill that President Clinton gave us last Congress, if Members opposed it, they ought to this year be for repealing two-

thirds of it, which is what the Republican budget reconciliation bill promises. It promises both the balanced budget in 7 years, and it promises to repeal at least two-thirds of that awful tax increase in the last Congress.

Let me make one final pitch to my colleagues. I am going to try to put this in terms I think families understand. I was raised, I think most of my colleagues were raised, to believe that we ought to leave something good to our children. We ought to leave them some patrimony, something of an inheritance out of what we earn and do not spend.

If we were raised to believe that we ought to leave something to our children that they can build their future on, then I think members will understand what I am about to say. We talk about crime in America. If we take all the crime that is committed on the streets of America and lump them all together, they are a misdemeanor compared to the crime we commit here in Washington when we budget not only the income we make this year but the income or children have not yet earned. When we spend every year the unearned income of our children and grandchildren to satisfy whatever we think is important for our life this year, we violate the most sacred pledge I think we make as parents to our children.

We ought to be giving them something good to build on. Instead, we are giving them debt and mortgage. We are giving them a promise that they will spend 80 percent of their income in Federal taxes to pay this debt.

Can we not agree to end it now? Can we not agree to pass a balanced budget amendment, and can we not agree to repeal some of that awful tax increase of the last Congress?

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to take time to remind the gentleman that I voted against that bill 2 years ago and ask him how he voted. But I do not think I will take that time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am a member of the coalition and proud of the work that our group has done. I appreciate the opportunity to address the question of how do we balance the budget in the United States in the mid-1990's.

I specifically would like to address the topic of the tax cuts. All politicians support efforts to cut taxes. The question is, when can it be done responsibly? the people of this country recognize that it is not prudent to cut taxes at this time. It is not prudent. In fact, it is pandering.

I have talked to a number of county commissioners throughout my congressional district, and there are 27 counties in my district; there are many county commissioners. These are gentlemen and women that appreciate the value of the dollar in obtaining maxi-

mum value from that dollar in the operation of Government. They have said to me, if you cut programs as deeply as you must in order to offset the loss of tax revenue in Washington, these are programs that will be picked up in rural America. As these programs are picked up in rural America, you will be increasing the property taxes on farmers in order to pay for tax cuts for affluent people in urban areas.

This is a shift of taxes. It is not a cut in taxes. This is shift No. 1.

The previous speaker eloquently reminded us of our obligations to our children. In fact, by cutting taxes at this point in time, what we are doing is enjoying the opportunity to spend more, to have more, at the expense of our children. This is shift No. 2. We are not cutting taxes, we are shifting taxes to our children.

Third, we are cutting other taxes and we are cutting other benefits. We are cutting an earned income tax credit in order to offset the loss of revenue. Shift No. 3.

We, indeed, have a bloated spending policy in this country. We must correct it. But the coalition believes that we need a diet. We do not need a dessert at this point in time. That is what the Republicans are dishing up, a dessert of a tax cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBAC], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Chairman, today I can say I am proud to be a Member of this Congress. Since 1969, this body has rejected its responsibility to balance the Federal budget. Today we vote to accept that responsibility, and I am proud that we are accepting that responsibility.

We were elected to this Congress to balance the budget, and this bill does that. We were elected to Congress for another reason, too. That was to make the Federal Government smaller, more efficient and more focused. This bill starts that process as well.

For instance, it eliminates the Department of Commerce, an agency that leads the list of those providing corporate welfare. This will be the first time in the history of the Republic that we have actually eliminated a Cabinet-level agency. That is in this bill to do it. We save \$6 billion in the process of doing that.

This budget reconciliation bill balances the budget, makes the Federal Government smaller, more efficient, more focused. This makes it a proud day for me, a good day for this country and a great day for my children and your children.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)



Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the coalition budget for four reasons. First of all, it looks towards the future first, not the past. Second, it does the heavy lifting first. Third, it borrows less money, leaves us with a surplus at the end of 2002 and again proves the prudence of doing the heavy lifting first. Finally, it is enforceable. It will do what it says it will do. It is not engaged in subverting other social policy goals such as robbing workers' pensions.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget reconciliation bill and in support of the coalition alternative plan.

I believe the time has come to balance the budget. This is what my constituents want because they know that the economic futures of their children and grandchildren depend on it. They want us to balance the budget in a way that is both fair and effective, and this is what the coalition substitute would do.

While I do not endorse each of its provisions, the coalition substitute is fair because it asks everyone, regardless of age or circumstance in life, to share the sacrifice for the benefit of the common good. Unlike the Republican plan, it does not transfer funding for social programs, that benefit the old and poor, to subsidize tax cuts for the rich.

The coalition substitute would balance the budget in 7 years. It places deficit reduction first and does not borrow money to pay for up-front tax cuts, like the Republican plan. Further, the coalition substitute will work, and it takes a rational and responsible approach to balancing the budget. Not only would it restore sane spending priorities by adding back funding for education, health, and economic development programs, it also achieves a budget surplus in 2002.

Less pain with more gain—Why? Because this alternative reconciliation bill reaffirms the logic of achieving a balanced budget one step at a time. The coalition plan would provide about \$42 billion more in deficit reduction—and less total debt—than envisioned in the budget resolution conference report. This means holding off on enacting expensive tax cuts, which require slashing vital programs, until we are well on our way to ensuring a health national economy that can be enjoyed by generations to come.

In contrast, the Republican budget backloads deficit reduction until after the year 2000, when the spending cuts kick in and interest rates decline. In fact, nearly two-thirds of the deficit reduction in the Republican plan occurs in the final 3 years. This is an approach that was tested in the early 1980's under President Reagan and failed. When it came time to make the difficult cuts, they did not materialize. Remember, the 1980s was the decade when the debt tripled under Republican control of the White House. Therefore, as far as the effectiveness of the approach to deficit reduction is concerned, I would say, "Been there, done that, let's not do it again."

Further, I have grave concerns about the approach taken in the Republican budget reconciliation bill. One of the most egregious parts of the Republican plan is a misguided proposal to raid workers' pensions that could jeopardize up to \$100 billion in pension assets and the retirement security of almost 15 million American families. Specifically, this bad proposal would gut pension rules so that com-

panies would be able to remove the so-called excess money—defined as 125 percent of current liabilities—from their pension funds. Currently, if a company takes excess funds out of a pension plan, a 20 percent to 50 percent excise tax is levied on the withdrawal. In addition, the company must pay income tax on the amount removed. To raise revenue, the Republican proposal would eliminate the excise tax entirely, giving companies a strong incentive to dip into pension funds.

Pension plan assets represent deferred compensation for plan participants. As such, workers and retirees should benefit from the profitable investment of these funds. I believe that any surplus assets should be used to insure the soundness of workers' pensions, or to fund benefit increases for plan participants, rather than going into unrelated management ventures.

I am adamantly opposed to this proposal because it would leave workers' pensions vulnerable in the event of an economic downturn. It could create a pension raid similar to the 1980's when the Federal Government was forced to take over underfunded pension plans, paying out billions of dollars in the process.

It seems the new Republican majority has forgotten the old Republican rallying cry—"Cut Spending First!" Balancing the budget is like curing a cold, the longer you put off swallowing bad-tasting medicine, the longer it takes to return to good health.

Finally, I am pleased that the coalition substitute includes enforcement language similar to what is contained in legislation I introduced earlier this year, along with our colleagues, Representatives STENHOLM, DOOLEY, BARRETT, MINGE, and POSHARD. Like my bill, H.R. 1516, the coalition substitute would enact tough, new measures to reform the budget process and eliminate the Federal budget deficit by the year 2002. It would do so by setting spending caps and using across-the-board cuts if the targets, set and evaluated by a nonpartisan board of estimates, are not met.

In January, I supported a constitutional amendment to balance the budget for the first time because I finally lost faith that the President and the Congress have the resolve to balance the budget without a constitutional mandate. While this initiative failed, I still believe that we need to hold our feet to the fire and enforce our budgetary decisions.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe that balancing the budget is our responsibility as Members of Congress. I have always supported a balanced budget, and the responsibility to achieve this is not one that I take lightly. Over the years, I have frequently taken the political road less traveled in the name of deficit reduction. When I am in northwest Indiana, I tell my constituents that I am opposed to cutting their taxes because it would undermine serious efforts to reduce the deficit. In March, I was one of only six Democrats to support the rescissions bill, H.R. 1158, because I believe we need to start making tough spending decisions now.

It is time to get serious about balancing the budget. I urge the adoption of the coalition substitute and the rejection of the Republican budget reconciliation bill.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], a member of the Committee on

the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I turned 59 years old last week, and in an effort to remind me of the advanced age I'm reaching, one of my friends sent me a birthday card which displayed the prices of common household items in the year I was born. A gallon of gas was a dime, a new car was \$600, and a new home was \$6,000.

My second grandchild was born recently, and I think of these prices when I consider what kind of future he will face. How much will Jameson, David, my most recent grandchild, and Katie Marie, see prices rise during their lifetime? Will the country still be a place of opportunity? Will there still be a thriving economy to support their generation? When I think about the answers to these questions, it becomes increasingly clear to me that the best thing I can do for my new grandchild is to vote "yes" on the reconciliation package.

When they look back on this day, our own children and grandchildren will judge us—and judge us harshly—if we fail to do our duty, if we continue to rob future generations because we do not have enough backbone to control our spending in this Chamber. Every time we deficit-spend we are refusing to take responsibility for our actions. We know what needs to be done, we should follow through with what we know is right.

Many constituents I've talked to have had concerns about specific programs they benefit from, but without fail, they also remind me to follow through with the promise to balance the budget. People are willing to accept the changes necessary to preserve our country's fiscal security, but they want us to make sure that what we do is fair, and that we follow through on our commitment to balance the budget.

What we do in this bill impacts the full scope of Federal spending. It engages everyone in the task of balancing the budget. I know there are many here today whose parochial interests lead them to declare this plan unfair. To those people I ask them to consider this: Is it fair to take the money, future, and opportunity from generations of Americans who aren't even born yet, who don't have representation yet? That's what we do when we deficit-spend and run up the debt. Someone pays and it isn't those of us in this room, it is our children and grandchildren who trust us to look out for them.

Protect our children's and grandchildren's future, ensure a future of opportunity, hold Government to the same balanced budget standards of families and businesses: pass reconciliation.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the sum total of 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] to conclude the discussion of the coalition reconciliation bill.



(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, balancing the budget is like trying to turn a blimp around in an alley. It is a tough task. Our coalition budget proposal balances the budget by the year 2002, and it is preferable to the Republican budget for two reasons:

First, because it has tough choices with fair outcomes. We keep children in Head Start. We do not buy B-2 bombers that the Defense Department does not even want.

Second, we say we should not pander to the electorate for tax cuts. Let us require shared sacrifice from all Americans to achieve a balanced budget. We do that. I encourage my colleagues to vote for the coalition budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. SHADEGG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, we are here engaged in a debate, and a central issue of that debate is the question of tax cuts. I hear my colleagues on the other side say we should not be doing tax cuts for the wealthy. Yet at the heart of our tax cut is a tax cut for every American who pays taxes and has children. I do not think that is the definition of the wealthy.

But I take the issue of whether or not we ought to be doing tax cuts as a serious one. I have a theory. The theory is that those of us here in this Congress all too often go home and talk to people who attend our townhalls or Rotary clubs or Kiwanis clubs. We do not talk to real Americans. So this last weekend, I went home and spent 2 hours talking to real Americans in front of drug stores and grocery stores and discount stores. I had a staffer do it, too. The results will shock my colleagues, and I urge them to do the same thing.

□ 1715

I talked to 55 different real Americans in my district, women who walked up with one child in their arms and a second following along behind them, and I asked them, I said, The Congress is engaged in a debate about whether we need deficit reduction or tax cuts or both. Do my colleagues know how they responded? I will tell my colleagues how they responded. Eighty-two percent said they need real tax cuts in their lives. Of the 55 people I talked to, 8 said we ought to be focused on deficit reduction, just 8 of 55. Thirty-two of the fifty-five said they want to see us both do deficit reduction and tax cuts because they do feel overburdened by today's taxes. Thirteen said they wanted tax cuts only. The burden of Federal taxes in their lives is oppressive.

By the way, in 1950 it was 1 dollar out of 50. Today it is 1 dollar out of every 4 that an American family earns.

So a total of 45 of the 55 said they needed tax cuts in their families. That

is not wealthy Americans. That is not rich Americans. I was not standing in front of ritzy stores. I was standing in front of the grocery stores and the discount markets, the Kmart, in my district talking to real Americans.

This is not a tax cut for the wealthy. It is a tax cut for every single American, and why are we going to do it? Mr. Chairman, it is their money, and they can spend it better than we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], who, under a previous unanimous-consent agreement, has 50 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, what is most troubling about this reconciliation proposal is tens of thousands of dollars of tax cuts will go to people who make \$300,000 and more. Working men and women will be hurt in numerous ways. Even Jack Kemp says that there is an increase in this proposal that the Republicans are offering on poor working families and the impact of dismantling the Commerce Department will leave them not just without a tax cut, a tax increase for these working families, it will leave them without a job.

Mr. Chairman, the Commerce Department over the last year and a half has been responsible for 300,000 new jobs in this country. Doing away with a Cabinet position of Commerce and replacing it with an agency head would be akin to taking the Secretary of Defense in the midst of the cold war and removing him from the Cabinet. As other countries increase their efforts at export promotion to make sure there are jobs for working Americans, this proposal from the Republican majority will undercut our country's ability to compete internationally, and it is, again, skewed illogically. While three-quarters of our exports are non-agricultural, three-quarters of the money in support of exports goes to agriculture and 25 percent, a cut of 25 percent, occurs on the manufactured side of exports, hurting our ability to compete further with Japan, with France, and other countries who take this competition very seriously.

One of the Republicans earlier called the middle-class people who make \$300,000 to \$700,000 a year. I only wish that was the middle class in America, but one thing the middle class wants more than anything is to make sure that their parents are safe with Medicare, if they need nursing home care, that is provided, and that they and their children have jobs and have the ability to work so that they can feed and pay for their family needs. That is central among what Americans want. Doing away with the Cabinet position of Secretary of Commerce saves no money and will cripple the Cabinet Secretary's ability to deal with Japan,

and France, and Germany and our other economic competitors.

Anyone who proposed after Pearl Harbor to do away with the Defense Department, to do away with the Secretary of Defense in the Cabinet, would have been run out of town. Today, as we have tens of billions of dollars of trade deficit with China and Japan, people who propose to diminish our ability to compete economically also ought to be run out of town.

Mr. Chairman, tax cuts do not do any good for working men and women who lose their jobs. This proposal will not only leave our mothers and fathers without adequate health care, it will leave them without jobs.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time to me, and I think everyone knows here, Mr. Chairman, that we have a problem. The problem is we spend more money than we have got. The American people know that, too, and they want a solution.

Now the one or two ways to do it. One of the ways that was tried here in 1993, and that is the President's approach, is to raise taxes. But, as we have all discovered, the American people are paying about 50 cents out of every dollar they make in taxes. Federal, State, and local; we add it all up, and it is 50 cents out of every dollar they make. Therefore on this side we have concluded that is an unacceptable approach. We cannot raise taxes. In fact, in order to lessen that crushing burden we need to reduce taxes and allow people to keep more of what they have got.

So, the only solution is the other one, and that is to cut spending. That is why I am excited about this reconciliation bill. It gives us the best opportunity we have had, in my time here surely, to get a handle on this problem and to deal with the fact that we are spending more money than we have got.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the welfare reform proposals that we so desperately need, it has Medicare proposals that will keep the system from going broke, it has the appropriations bills that are on budget target. The result of all that is that we will be on the path to balancing the budget in the year 2002, something the American people desperately want us to do.

The only thing that I would urge my colleagues to avoid in all this process though is the danger of demagoguery, and there is a tremendous danger, we are all guilty of it at times on our side, maybe when we are talking about President Clinton's tax increase. They engage in a little bit of that on their side in this debate. There is a lot of demagoguery that scares a lot of people to death. There is only one difference: We did not scare many people

that were well-to-do with a fear about a tax increase. But if my colleagues continue the demagoguery on Medicare, they are going to scare a whole lot of people to death out there in America that are very worried about how they are going to make it. We intend to save the program so that they can make it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, before I yield briefly to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], let me set the scene. The Committee on Science has referred to this as the Commerce Dismantling Act because we have either full or partial jurisdiction over about two-thirds of the Commerce budget, particularly NOAA and NIST, and we considered that and took certain actions which basically were taken unanimously in the committee which would have protected to some degree the programs of NOAA and NIST, which includes some very important functions critical to the safety of the country. The amendments that we adopted unanimously in committee and reported out to the floor mysteriously disappeared on their way to the reconciliation bill, and therefore they do not appear, and we want to point some of these things out, and this chart shows what happened.

First of all, the programs under our jurisdiction were faced with an arbitrary cut of 25 percent. A considerable number of programs were transferred to other jurisdictions, and some of them were specifically cut or eliminated, particularly in NIST, where the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Extension Program were emasculated.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] for some comments about the subject that he spent a lot of time on, the weather programs.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me, and I want to make a point, perhaps with the gentleman's help, about our Weather Service programs carried under the umbrella of NOAA, the National Weather Service.

Two weeks ago in the debate on the omnibus science bill, Mr. Chairman, we came to the floor with an issue that relates to the certification of the Weather Service offices, and a lot of us from both sides of the aisle were very concerned that unless this amendment, the amendment that I offered in the Cramer amendment, passed, that we could see the offices shut by a bureaucrat rather than going through the certification process that the existing law preserved.

I would ask the ranking member of the Committee on Science, if we passed

the Republican reconciliation plan today, the Cramer amendment that passed that preserved the certification process, that would be done away with; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN of California. Yes, that is correct, and that would be a serious blow to the efficacy of our weather system throughout the United States because we are going through a major transition. The law requires, and the gentleman's amendment required, that we do not close stations unless it is certified by appropriate authority, that this does not decrease the availability of service, and that is not a part of the language that is contained in this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. If the ranking member would continue to yield, that is a very important public safety issue that we would be giving up if we passed the Republican plan today.

Mr. BROWN of California. That is absolutely correct.

Now in the brief time that I have I am just going to make a couple of points, and I hope my colleagues can see this chart. What we were faced with, what we have in this bill, is the 25-percent mandatory reduction plus the elimination of the ATP program, the Manufacturing Extension Program, the NOAA Ocean Environmental Program. These have to be a part of the 25-percent cut, but they are not sufficient to make it all up. After we make all of these cuts which in effect destroy these technology programs, there is still a gap of \$203 million which has to be made up in order to meet the 25-percent requirement.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to scare people by saying that we will utterly destroy the Nation's weather system or anything like that. On the other hand I want to rebut the statement that this does no harm to the weather system. We cannot take \$203 million, which is the amount that NOAA will have to absorb in a program which is largely weather-related, without doing severe damage to our existing weather reporting system which is undergoing a major transition at that time. We will undoubtedly have to close more stations and close them more rapidly than we would otherwise.

This is not what the committee voted to do when we had this bill before us, the Commerce Reorganization Act or dismantling act. We do not think it should be in this bill, and we suggest that this is another good reason to vote no on this reconciliation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2517 and the process that has prevented Members on both sides of the aisle from making this a workable reconciliation process.

When the Rules Committee met, I offered two amendments relating to title XVII of the bill which abolishes the Department of Commerce. These, in fact, were similar to amendments successfully adopted when the Science Committee marked up this bill.

The first of these would delete the arbitrary funding cap which, we have found, would heavily impact the Government's ability to provide basic weather services for the protection of the public.

Section 17207(g) of the bill aims to reduce the funding for the remnants of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Institute of Standards by 25 percent below fiscal year 1995 spending levels. The intent, I believe, was to eliminate administrative overhead. The problem here is that both agencies have depended heavily on departmental level administrative support since they have been a part of the Department of Commerce. Less than 10 percent of each agency's 1995 budget is related to program management at all, and only a fraction of that could be considered administrative overhead.

The chart before you shows how this arbitrary budget cap would affect the functions of the two agencies. For NOAA, over 70 percent of the agency funding is directly related or supports weather forecasting. This involves the weather offices around the country, the Doppler radars that are being installed to provide better severe weather tracking, and the satellites that have revolutionized hurricane tracking and overall weather predictions. The remainder of NOAA is related to coastal and fishery programs and supports a multibillion dollar industry.

The NIST supports the setting of standards, basic research, and of course, technology programs which the Republicans have found ideologically objectionable.

The formula contained in the bill requires a 25-percent reduction to these programs. The right-hand bar shows how these reductions will play out.

First, the bill would target investment programs such as the Advanced Technology Program and the Manufacturing Extension Program, which incidentally the House has voted on several occasions to support.

Next, the bill targets certain coastal and fishery programs and environmental programs which have been carried out by NOAA.

After all is said and done, the formula still requires over \$200 million in arbitrary reductions to ongoing programs which will have to come out of weather services within NOAA and basic research within NIST.

In advance of consideration of this bill today, I conducted a survey of State Governors to determine how they would cope with the possibility of a diminished level of services, especially for weather and fishery programs. In particular, I wanted to address the issue of how the States would pick up the slack and supplement any shortfall as a result of this provision. I would like to include in the record at the appropriate time a sample of the responses that I have received. I will also include a more detailed analysis of how this overall budget cap will affect the two agencies.

When the Chrysler bill was brought before the Science Committee, an amendment was offered to delete a similar budgetary provision. This amendment was strongly supported by both sides of the aisle and easily adopted. I want to acknowledge, however, that there is a technical difference in the base text compared to that we deleted in committee.

Rather than forcing an across-the-board reduction as the original Chrysler bill did, this bill makes a general reduction. The effect is the same, however. Both legislative forms mask the true impact of such budgetary reductions. Both seek to convey the impression that it is easy to make cuts—just pick a number. The reality is that when authorizing or appropriating committees look at the substance of these

programs, such cuts do not come so easily. This top down, arbitrary approach to budget cutting avoids our basic responsibility as an institution to conduct oversight and set priorities.

The details of how the cuts would be implemented are still lacking because of the magnitude of the changes that would have to be made. In a recent hearing before the Science Committee, Dr. Elbert Friday, Director of the National Weather Service, testified that such cuts would force a fundamental restructuring of the modernized weather forecasting system we are now more than half way through. There is no question that some and perhaps many weather offices would have to be closed. I am cognizant that the Republican leadership does not want to hear such talk and they have branded it as a scare tactic. I believe that we will find that it is the reality.

I would now like to speak briefly on another amendment I offered before the Rules Committee. That amendment would delete the provision in this bill that repeals the organic legislation establishing NIST's Manufacturing Extension Program. This is a back-door attempt to kill a program which has received bipartisan support every time it has come up for a vote this year for authorizations or appropriations.

The MEP is a proven program which has breathed new life into thousands of small businesses around the country, and in no small

measure, has contributed to the resurgence of American manufacturers. MEP often has been the only place that traditional small businesses, faced with extinction unless they learned how to become a just-in-time, high tech supplier for their traditional customers, could go for help in making the transition. MEP also is cost-effective; one independent review documented \$8 of direct benefit to small businesses for every Federal dollar going into the program. It clearly would be penny-wise, pound-foolish to use this bill to override the reasoned judgment about MEP of the committees of jurisdiction.

There are many matters in this bill that deserve far greater attention than has been given them in this process. I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting against this misguided bill.

#### IMPACT OF RECONCILIATION BILL ON SCIENCE AGENCIES

The Chrysler bill does three things: (a) it transfers certain functions to other agencies, (b) mandates the termination of certain functions, and (c) places a cap of 75% of F.Y. 95 spending for the sum of NOAA and NIST programs excluding the transferred programs.

All program transfers are related to NOAA and account for \$55 million. Thus the adjusted base for the combined total is:

NOAA F.Y. 95 level 1972 (-55) .....	1,917
NIST F.Y. 95 level .....	700
Total .....	2,617

The 75% limitation would allow a total spending of 1963.

The resulting reduction of \$654 million would, to some extent, be offset by mandated terminations which account for \$36 million in NOAA and \$415 million in NIST. This would leave \$203 million in net reductions that would need to be allocated to the remaining NOAA/NIST programs. The agencies would allocate this on a pro rated basis proportional to the remaining budget requirements.

NOAA 95—1972 less transfers/terminations equals 1881.

NIST 95—700 less transfers/terminations equals 285.

Total—2672 less transfers/terminations equals 2166.

Thus, of the remaining combined budgetary requirements, 87% are related to NOAA and 13% are related to NIST. Applying these to the \$203 million cut, assume that NOAA is cut by 177 and assume that NIST is cut by 26.

This will result in a NOAA budget of \$1,704 million and a NIST budget of \$259 million. The following table shows how this compares to other budgetary actions.

Agency	Fiscal year 1995	Fiscal year 1996				Budget re-quirement <sup>1</sup>	H.R. 2517
		Re-quest	Author-ization	House appro-pria-tion	Senate appro-pria-tion		
NOAA .....	1,972	2,094	1,725	1,817	1,993	1,881	1,704
NIST .....	701	1,023	338	404	351	285	259
Total .....	2,673	3,117	2,063	2,221	2,344	2,166	1,963

<sup>1</sup>The "Budgetary Requirements" is defined in this context as the 1995 spending level minus program transfers and terminations. That is, this is the remaining funding needed for NOAA and NIST from which the general reduction of \$203 million must be made.

Thus, NOAA would be cut by 11% below the F.Y. 95 baseline adjusted for program transfers and 9% below the baseline remaining after both transfers and terminations are subtracted from the base.

NIST would be cut by 63% below the F.Y. 95 baseline and 9% if terminations are subtracted from the base.

For the resulting NOAA/NIST conglomerate, the spending cap will cut below the House appropriations level by 11% and the Senate appropriations level by over 16%.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT,

Providence, RI, October 10, 1995.

Rep. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Thank you for your timely warning with regards to H.R. 1756, which would dismantle the Department of Commerce and terminate or severely reduce state fisheries and estuary research grant programs. The impacts on Rhode Island's programs of such actions would be devastating.

Our Division of Fish and Wildlife currently receives \$126,320 from NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service via the Inter-jurisdictional Fisheries Act P.L. 99-659. Funding from this Act is used for support of the Rhode Island Marine Fisheries Council (\$37,500) and the Rhode Island Lobster Research and Management Program (\$88,740). Loss of funds would require that we terminate two biologists and reallocate funds to cover staff activities which support the Marine Fisheries Council, our state's lead fisheries management organization.

The Division also receives \$118,800 from the federal Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act. No state match is required. Currently the funding is utilized to provide support to the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Council fisheries management process. It allows staff to provide input to ASMFC management boards and to collect field data in support of the ASMFC process. Half of the appropriation has been awarded to the Division of Enforcement to supporting species management plan mandates.

As you know, the ACFMA gives the Secretary of Commerce the authority, through the ASMFC, to close fisheries in Atlantic Coast states if they fail to comply with fisheries management plans implemented under its authorization. This action would have a devastating impact on the Rhode Island fishing industry and its ability to participate in the management process. Our inability to provide timely fisheries regulations could further jeopardize the fishing industry's ability to survive during this era of depressed stock abundance and availability.

Reduction of the Narragansett Bay National Estuarine Reserve Grant by 25% or \$28,000 would require either eliminating the entire monitoring program or the entire education program, or reducing both by one half which would effectively be the same as elimination of both.

A final possible reduction would be to lay off the Reserve's part-time manager, which would render the Reserve non-operational and deprive the monitoring program of his substantial volunteer efforts. Any alternative would functionally shut down the Reserve.

If I can be of any assistance to you or your committee in defending NOAA's marine fish-

eries assistance programs as the valuable and cost-effective programs that they are, I would be most happy to do so.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY R.E. KEENEY,

Director,

Department of Environmental Management.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES

Baton Rouge, LA, October 11, 1995.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,  
House of Representative, Committee on Science,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: This is in response to your letter of September 26, 1995 to Governor Edwin W. Edwards relative to proposed legislation, HR 1756 by Congressman Dick Chrysler, which intends to dismantle the Department of Commerce. It is our understanding that in its current form the bill would transfer many programs within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to other agencies, terminate state fisheries grants and promotions programs, terminate basic research programs, and severely reduce the budget for remaining NOAA programs. Our agency strongly supports the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and its parent, NOAA, and feel that these agencies should continue their mission unchanged. We have worked closely with the NMFS over the years on a wide variety of issues and have found this group to be effective in bringing together diverse interests to develop mid-ground solutions and create a fair balance among conflicting positions.

Repeal of NMFS' authority to provide fisheries related grants and substantial reductions in NMFS' research and management capabilities, would severely impede important Federal activities including the rebuilding of fish stocks, expansion of the economic benefits of the nation's marine fisheries, and the enhancement of the U.S.'s position in global trade. From a state's perspective it would also severely curtail our research and management activities for our important renewable marine resources.

While we agree with the overall goal of eliminating unnecessary programs and increasing governmental efficiency, we feel that NOAA and NMFS' have proven their effectiveness and respectively suggest that any reduction or dismembering of these important agencies would not be in our best interest.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOE L. HERRING,  
Secretary.

□ 1730

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Budget Reconciliation Act. I support it because this is a true blueprint to reach a balanced budget for the Federal Government. Reaching a balance budget is not going to be easy. There are a number of decisions that were made in the Budget Reconciliation Act with which I do not agree. I hope they will be changed as this bill goes through the system to the other body, and then the conference.

Further, I want to acknowledge that some good programs are going to feel a pinch under this budget, but the fact is that we have to stop deficit spending. For 25 years in a row our Government has spent more than it has taken in. The first result of that is we have a national debt of almost \$5 trillion. That is an immoral legacy to leave to our children.

The problem with deficit spending is not just in the national debt that will have to be paid off some day by future generations. It affects us in today's budget. The interest on the national debt, and when the Federal Government borrows the Federal Government pays interest, like anyone else, any individual or business would do, the interest on the national debt for the last fiscal year that just ended September 30 will come in about at about \$235 billion. That is the third highest line item in Federal spending today, after Social Security and the military, but not by much.

The point is that \$235 billion is money that the taxpayers already send to Washington, but we throw it out the window in the sense that we take the taxpayers' money, write a check to pay interest on the national debt, and get nothing back in return, because interest buys nothing.

I think those that are emphasizing the effect of balancing the budget on various programs, and they may be

correct, should ask themselves, how much could we do for health care, how much could we do for other programs, for science, for example, if we had the use of \$235 billion that is lost in interest?

That is why I urge adoption of the Budget Reconciliation Act.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the majority once again bypassed the normal committee process by asking the Rules Committee to include in the reconciliation bill a package of civil service provisions which have never been approved by the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

The majority proposes to make changes in the civil service retirement system, some of which have not even received the benefit of a hearing. They would delay retiree COLA's, increase agency and employee contributions into the retirement fund, and then, incredible as it may seem, establish a commission to study the retirement system and report recommendations for reforms, 7 months after the so-called reforms in this bill have already been made.

Both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service have said, contrary to what Republican leadership claims that there is no crisis affecting the solvency of the retirement system which necessitates passage of these reforms to resolve. Therefore, there is absolutely no need to require agencies and employees to pay more into the retirement trust fund to make it financially secure. Clearly, this is not an attempt at serious reform. There is another purpose.

With tax cuts for the rich being packaged into the reconciliation bill in a second attempt to get them enacted, the civil service pension system is once again being used by the Republican leadership as a source of offsetting revenue to pay for them. That's what this package is all about. I am opposed to it. For those rich folks who are not middle class, who earn more than \$100,000 a year, that is what this package is about. I am opposed to the manner in which it was brought forward. Our committee's work should not be done by the Rules Committee, but through the normal, open, and deliberative legislative process.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee is also expected to include the Debt Collection Improvement Act in the reconciliation bill. While the bill had a number of good features, it also has many important flaws, which we Democrats has hoped to resolve when the bill would be marked up in the committee. It now appears that we will not have that chance.

Let me describe three of the worst features of the debt collection bill. The

first provision would allow private debt collection companies to collect debts owed to the Internal Revenue Service. While the Ways and Means Committee is working on a taxpayer bill of rights, this bill allows the IRS to give confidential tax information to private bill collectors, who could use all sorts of harassment to get the money.

The second provision would require our constituents who get Federal benefits, such as Social Security or veterans benefits, to receive their benefits through electronic funds transfers to a bank. Not everybody has a bank account. Not everybody has a checking account. I believe that particularly senior citizens and others who are disabled ought to be able to have the option to choose whether or not they want the check to go through an electronic process.

The third provision would allow the Federal Government to garnish Social Security checks to collect debts owed to the Government, and make deductions from Social Security checks even for individuals making just \$10,000 a year. If we want to improve debt collection, we shouldn't focus on people who need every nickel just to pay the rent, heat, and grocery bills.

Putting the debt collection bill on the reconciliation bill without committee consideration is an example of the sloppy, unthinking approach that has gone into this terrible reconciliation bill.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for 40 years the Democrats have tried to tax this Nation out of debt. Everyone knows you can't tax and spend your way out of debt, it's a failed policy, and it's time for change. Today, Republicans have a plan not only to balance the budget, but to return to our families, our workers, our seniors, and our businesses their hard-earned money by enacting much-needed tax relief.

Democrats must learn that taxes do nothing for our economy except slow its growth and stifle job creation. Just last week, in my home State of Texas, the President finally admitted that the Democrat policies of the past have failed, by admitting that his \$258 billion tax increase was a mistake. He was right.

We must end the Government thirst for taking America's tax dollars and spending it on more Government programs, more Government bureaucrats, and more Government waste. We must remember that it's the people and businesses of this country that produce the capital, the goods, and the jobs that make this country the most powerful economic Nation in the world.

If we keep the Democrat plan of higher taxes and higher Government spending we will finally collapse under the

weight of a tremendous debt. Our children will pay over \$187,000 in taxes just to pay the interest on that debt.

That is why it is so important for the Senate and the House to pass this balanced budget plan. And the President should sign it in the best interest of the American people. Unlike the President's unbalanced budget, this bill will balance the Nation's budget by the year 2002.

We must remember history. Every time this body has cut taxes in the past, we have experienced more growth, created more jobs, and brought more revenue into the Federal Government.

Each time we let the American people keep more of their money for investment and savings—we have induced a healthier, more robust economy. That's a fact.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans believe in the American people, not the Federal Government. A vote against this budget is a vote for more debt, more Government, and more taxes.

A vote for this balanced budget is a vote for a better, a freer Nation, vote for America's future. Put your faith in this Nation and vote for this bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, for accuracy in history, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is important as we make the various statements, and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, has just made an excellent statement regarding the political rhetoric to which I agree, but when we look back at the actual facts and go back to 1981, there is one thing that he conveniently leaves out. That is that we increased our national debt \$3.9 trillion during the 10-year period that followed the decisions of 1981.

Spending, and this is something we have been talking about today, spending, and spending in the 1993 budget agreement, there was one thing about the 1993 budget agreement that I would think most of us on both sides of the aisle would agree with. That is, when we look at spending. The 1993-based discretionary spending was \$542 billion. In 1997, it was \$553 billion that is a 2-percent increase since 1993 assumptions, baseline. In 1981, the base was \$308 billion. In 1985, 4 years later, \$416 billion, a 35-percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, our point is the Coalition budget that we submit is better than, better than the majority's budget. It gets to balance in 2002. We do not quarrel about the spending. We agree. However, we say do the spending first. Let us not repeat the mistakes of 1981, when we did the tax cuts first and the deficit exploded. Let us do the spending cuts, and do not be as critical of the 1993 budget as many of the people are if they are concerned about spending, because it has done much better than we were able to do in the early 1980's.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that the reason why Democrats are going to offer a budget on the floor tomorrow that they claim cuts the deficit is because they are increasing taxes again. Sure, we can continue to talk about all these things if we are willing to increase taxes, but the fact is what their budget does is increase taxes in 1996 for the average taxpayer by \$188, and in 1997, by about \$150 more. They do it by simply keeping in place what they passed back in 1993 in the President's proposal that raises taxes out through infinity. What they do is, instead of doing what we are trying to do, cut taxes for the American people, what they do is increase taxes. They continue to increase taxes indefinitely, and that is the reason why they have argued.

Democrats love taxes. They love to increase them, they love to spend them, and that is exactly what they are going to do here. They are going to increase taxes over the next couple of years by about \$300 or more on each individual taxpayer, and then tell us that we should not cut taxes and try to give those people a break.

The fact is that the budget they are going to bring on the floor is a tax increase budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, that argument we just heard is so ludicrous, to suggest that our budget is increasing taxes by failing to repeal taxes in existence. Under the same argument, the Republican budget is increasing taxes by failing to repeal many of the provisions of the 1993 tax increase, which they do not repeal in their budget. I voted against that, just as many of them voted against that. But to suggest that we are increasing taxes by failing to repeal taxes is ludicrous beyond belief.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from the great State of Texas [Mr. ARCHER], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to rise today and join a great debate at a turning point in this country's history. This debate is not only about balancing the budget to save our children. The debate is about ushering out the era of tax and spend and beginning a new era of smaller Government, less taxes, and less spending.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill is passed, the years of tax and spend will be buried on the ash heap of an unsuccessful history, and a new, more prosperous era marked by economic prosperity for all Americans will begin.

For too many years, Congress' first and last solution to every problem was to raise taxes. I am here to say that those days are over, and we are here to bring tax relief to the American people, especially to middle-income Americans who have paid the price and seen their taxes go up and up to support big Government solutions that fail to achieve their intended results. Our tax relief package has two goals. One is tax relief to strengthen the American family. The second is tax relief to create jobs and economic growth for all Americans.

Our centerpiece is a \$500 per child tax credit that will mainly benefit lower- and middle-income Americans. Twenty-seven million families with 51 million children will benefit from this credit. If you are a family with two children and you make \$30,000 a year, this credit will wipe out more than one-half of your income tax liability. It will give you a 15 percent total tax cut, including payroll taxes. You will get \$1,000 more in your pocket for you to use as you see fit, not for the Government to use on your behalf.

If you make \$50,000, your tax cut with two children will be 8 percent, including payroll taxes.

□ 1745

As a result of this credit, 2 million lower-income families will no longer pay any income tax. They will be removed from the income tax rolls.

Mr. Chairman, our bill provides relief from the marriage penalty; it provides a credit to help families adopt children; it provides help for those who care for their ailing parents in the loving environment of their own home. We provide a new American dream savings account; and yes, with a spousal IRA to go with it for the woman who stays in the home, to help families at the most important moment in their lives, the first time they purchase a home, or when they need to tap into their savings for medical expenses and for their educational needs. All of these provisions will help strengthen the heart and soul of the Nation: The American family.

Mr. Chairman, our second goal is to create an economic climate that includes good jobs for all of our workers. That is why we include a capital gains tax cut that fortifies America's private sector job-crating machine.

This week I realized two new studies indicating that more than 200,000 jobs will be created every year as a result of the Contract With America capital gains tax cut. Revenues to the Treasury will be increased, and GDP will increase by 1.7 percent. Mr. Chairman, cutting capital gains taxes is a winner for every American. We must also remember that 59 percent of the returns that declare capital gains are with Americans whose income is \$50,000 or less.

As we move ahead to balance the budget, it is appropriate that the middle-income taxpayers of this country,

who have worked so hard and paid so much, receive their share of the dividend that a balanced budget brings.

This is not our balanced budget bill, Mr. Chairman. This balanced budget belongs to the people of the United States, and it is high time that they get the tax relief they so rightfully deserve.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it was good to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The only problem is that 85 percent of the people in West Virginia, those earning under \$50,000 a year, will see significant benefit cuts, program cuts like student loans and other programs, so that 1.5 percent, those earning over \$100,000 a year, can get \$2,400 back in their envelope, which is not a very good deal by any means.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the Economic Development Administration, and particularly, what the Kasich substitute does to that. Because what would happen with the EDA, it would be transferred to the Small Business Administration where it would be a block grant program administered by 25 employees.

Now, conversely, the bipartisan Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure-reported EDA bill provides meaningful reform for the same amount of money to the existing EDA program without jeopardizing the local, State, and Federal partnership critical to building distressed communities.

Our bill would launch the Nation's economic development programs on a new effort. It would remove much of the bureaucracy. It would remove archaic eligibility requirements. Gone would be the time-consuming and cumbersome approval process. This is not pie in the sky. It has been reported from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by a unanimous vote, and yet the Kasich substitute would gut the EDA.

This bill saves every penny that the Kasich substitute saves. It authorizes, as the Kasich bill does, EDA programs at \$340 million per year, saving \$1.5 billion over 5 years. It has, as I mentioned, both unanimous support, and certainly the bipartisan support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], former ranking member of the subcommittee from California, Mr. Mineta, myself as ranking member of the subcommittee, and the Republican freshman class president.

This committee has repeatedly supported the EDA, despite what is in the Kasich substitute. It was unanimously reported the first time and readopted when the Commerce Department Dismantling Act included in the Kasich substitute was before the committee.

Indeed, on the floor of this House, by a 310 to 115 vote, this House supported, with the majority of Democrats, a majority of Republicans and a majority of the new Members, supported keeping the EDA.

Members know that the EDA works. In its 30-year history, EDA has created or retained 2.8 million jobs, invested \$15.6 billion in our distressed communities, and generated \$3 of private investment for every EDA dollar spent.

Just recently I was at a groundbreaking where I calculated that for the \$2 million to \$3 million of EDA funds that went into a water system that leveraged \$130 million of private investment, the Federal taxpayer would get back every penny that was invested in a 3.5-year period, and the result would be 800 new jobs. That is investment. That is growth, and that is how you really get about balancing the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to help me strip this EDA-killer from this bill.

Mr. KASHICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to debate on this reconciliation bill that we will be voting on here in the House tomorrow, and I am astounded at the lack of understanding that the other side continues to give to the idea of cutting taxes for American citizens. They still are telling us that cutting taxes is a dirty word. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, what is so wrong with leaving money in the pockets of the American citizens?

Let us take a look at what we are really talking about here in the Budget Reconciliation Act. Twenty-five percent of the tax cuts that we are talking about are going to businesses, especially to small business. Seventy-five percent of the tax cuts focus specifically on building and strengthening and restoring the American family. We do not just give tax cuts to the rich. We give tax cuts to everybody, to individuals, to families, rich, poor, middle class. That is the strength of this plan. We give tax cuts to all Americans.

A couple of facts, Mr. Chairman. In 1950, the average American family with children paid 2 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. Today, 45 years later, that very same family pays 24.5 percent, and adding State and local taxes, the total percentage adds up to 37.6 percent of their income in taxes to all levels of government. That means, Mr. Chairman, in families where both of the parents work, a very common situation today, two-thirds of the wife's earnings go to pay increased Federal taxes.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the average American family literally spends more on total taxes than on food, clothing,

and housing combined. Shouldering heavy burdensome taxes is no way for an American family to achieve the American dream. We want to make it easier. We want to keep these dollars in the pockets of the American citizens.

Let us talk about some of the tax cuts that we believe make our bill unique that we are really getting done for the American people.

First of all, a \$500-per-child tax credit. This is the centerpiece of our efforts to give American families a little bit of a breakthrough tax relief, \$500 for each child under age 18.

The current tax systems penalized families with children because it does not properly reflect the very expensive cost of rearing children. According to the Census Bureau data, the cost of raising a child averages more than \$5,000 per year. By allowing families to keep a little bit more of what they earn, the family tax credit increases the resources available to parents to properly raise their children.

Second, the American dream savings account. Mr. Chairman, the American dream savings account is a unique, innovative use of the IRA concept to stimulate additional savings. The new proposal allows distributions to be made penalty-free and tax-free for worthwhile purposes like first-time home purchase, college or educational expenses, and medical expenses.

Lastly, the spousal IRA. This permits \$2,000 for the stay-at-home, just as a working spouse. I urge all of my colleagues to support reconciliation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle say that they are making history. I see them patting each other on the back for devising a budget scam that protects the wealth of the powerful and the privileged. I hear them say that they are doing this because it takes a lot of courage on their part.

Well, I would like to ask them to put their own self-congratulations on hold for a moment and to think about the people who truly made history, who truly protected our Nation, and those who truly demonstrated courage. Who has the answer to that question? America's veterans.

With all of the grand rhetoric you hear, the Republicans would have you believe that they would never harm the men and women who have served our Nation. Well, let us listen to some of the facts instead. Let us start with the cuts proposed over the next 7 years to the VA.

One result, increased copayments for veterans who need a prescription. It might sound like a good example of self-sacrifice to some. Well, Members of this House have that luxury. We are not living on an income of \$12,000 or \$10,000 a year, but many veterans do.



Members of this House talk about how hard a job this is to be a Member of the U.S. Congress. Well, most of us do not have to sacrifice our health for the sake of serving our country, but many veterans did sacrifice their health. Yet this House will force the VA to care for 1 million fewer veterans by the year 2002. By the year 2002, it is estimated that over 175,000 veterans will lose coverage under Medicaid, one-third of whom are severely disabled, with crippling diseases or mental illnesses.

About 20,000 veterans a year depend on Medicaid, not the VA, not Medicare, but Medicaid, for their nursing home care. What do they have to look forward to during the next 7 years? The possibility that their spouses will have to give up their homes in order to retain eligibility for long-term care. The threat that a widow's VA pension gets counted against her in determining her edibility for Medicare. The likelihood that in States like California, Florida, New York, and Illinois, thousands of veterans will have no alternatives for health care.

Let us keep in mind that just a few short years ago, one State, Tennessee, proposed denying health care to veterans.

More importantly, it is not the job of the States to take care of this issue. When I speak to veterans back in Chicago, they did not fight for the great State of Illinois, they fought for our Nation, our country. Veterans in the district of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], they did not fight for Ohio, they fought for our country, the United States of America.

If you are a Republican and you have not found a reason to oppose this budget, please make sure you have thought this through. This budget is antiveteran. Your tax cuts for millionaires are being paid for by millions of veterans. Instead of veterans' health, you have chosen to protect someone else's wealth. It is wrong. Vote against this proposal.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], one of the leading experts in the Nation on welfare reform.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, after expanding the welfare state for 60 years, President Clinton and the Democrat Party failed to deliver on the Clinton campaign promise to end welfare as we know it. Yet, while every lever of power was controlled by the Democrats, no one acted to save the millions of children that today remain trapped on welfare as we know it.

In the Democratic Congress, no Democrat welfare reform bill was approved in committee, none was advanced to the House and Senate floor, and none came to the President's desk for signature. Republican and bipartisan efforts to reform welfare were stymied.

In contrast, House Republicans today are taking another huge step to deliver

on our pledge to the American people to replace the failed welfare system. We promised to bring real welfare reform to the House floor for a vote, and we kept our word. We pledged to cut programs, to cut redtape, and to slow exploding welfare spending, and we did just that.

In the next few weeks, we will send a bill to President Clinton that will forever change welfare from a way of life into a way to help America's poor get work and free themselves from government handouts.

Mr. Chairman, everyone agrees that reforming welfare is necessary. Candidates in both parties have campaigned on the need to reform welfare and have won a lot of votes talking about change. But there is a big difference in this town between talk and action.

To Republicans, the options have been clear: Whether to save the failed welfare system or save the children it traps in poverty forever. We chose to save the children. That is why Members who want to reform the failed welfare system will vote for this reconciliation bill, because they know it is right for our children and it is particularly right for our children's future.

□ 1800

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Budget Reconciliation Act due to the fact that it opposes the dreams and aspirations of all Americans and wrecks health care for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke last night about the devastation Republican budget cuts would inflict on children throughout the United States. Tonight, I rise to speak about the impact these cuts would have on children in my home State of Texas.

The Republican plan to balance the budget would eliminate Medicaid coverage for as many as 206,641 children in Texas and 4.4 million children nationwide in 2002. The Republican budget cuts Medicaid funding to Texas by \$7 billion over 7 years and by 20 percent in 2002 alone.

Currently, 20 percent of children in Texas rely on Medicaid for their basic health needs. Medicaid pays for immunizations, regular checkups, and intensive care in case of emergencies for about 1,407,000 children in Texas. Even if Texas could absorb half of the cuts by reducing services and provider payments, it would still have to eliminate coverage for 360,097 people, including 206,641 children in 2002.

Many of the children in Texas who would be denied coverage are disabled. Medicaid provides valuable services for many disabled children, often making the difference that allows them to live at home with their parents. Medicaid provides for items such as wheelchairs, communication devices, in-home therapy, respite care and home modifications. Without

these services, parents may be forced to give up their jobs or seek institutional placement for children. The cuts would also deny as many as 44,070 disabled children in Texas SSI cash benefits in 2002.

Republican cuts are terribly short-sighted. Cutting the debt today, Republicans argue, will save children from paying unbearable taxes in the future. But this only benefits those children who grow up to be job holders and taxpayers. Budget cuts would fall heavily on poor and lower-middle class children, leaving them less able to hold jobs in the years to come. Hungry, malnourished, nonimmunized children cannot be expected to concentrate in school. These children will prove less able to compete for good jobs with children from affluent families.

For example, Republican cuts would deny Head Start to 12,512 children in Texas and 180,000 children nationwide in 2002. The Republican budget repeals the Vaccines for Children Program, putting at risk at least \$1.5 billion over 7 years that would otherwise provide vaccinations for children in Texas and across the Nation. The Republicans would cut food stamp benefits for families with children in Texas by \$3,107 over 7 years. These cuts would jeopardize child nutrition programs on which 2,743 children in Texas depend. The House Republican budget block grants funding for the school lunch and WIC Program. Nationally, their budget reduces funding for child nutrition programs by more than \$10 billion over 7 years and 11 percent in 2002, compared with current law.

The Republican cuts in educational programs would have a devastating, long term effect on our Nation's youth. For example, Republicans would cut the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, which 1,043 out of 1,053 school districts in Texas use to keep crime, violence, and drugs away from their children, schools, and communities. They would eliminate Goals 2000, denying improved teaching and learning for as many as 413,400, denying improved teaching and learning for as many as 413,400 school children in Texas in 1996, and 949,800 children in 2002. And they would eliminate both the AmeriCorps National Service Program, denying 3,171 young people in Texas the opportunity to serve their communities in 1996; and the summer jobs program for 42,491 youths in Texas in 1996 and 297,437 youths over 7 years.

The Republicans would scale back environmental protections which keep our children healthy and strong. The Republican budget would allow sewage to flow into waters where Texan children live and play. Texas will lose \$16.7 million used to treat water pollution and protect public health.

The Republican budget halts the President's effort to protect the health and safety of children living near the 32 oil refineries in Texas. These refineries emitted more than 27,141,998 pounds of toxic air pollution in 1993, putting children in surrounding communities at risk of serious health problems including cancer and respiratory illnesses such as asthma.

The Republican budget cuts spending on toxic waste cleanups by 36 percent. There are at least 4 toxic waste sites in Texas. The Republican cuts will stop, or slow the clean-up, of sites near Jasper, Texarkana, Arlington, and my district of Houston.

The Republican's proposed \$500-a-child tax credit would do little to help children in low-income households. Families that have no Federal income tax liability after other exemptions and deductions would not be eligible for refunds. In Texas, 2,466,000 children in working families would have their taxes raised by an average of \$430 in 2002. Families with two or more children in Texas will face an average tax increase of \$500.

Too many children in my district of Houston are in poverty, and too many are at risk of poverty. I find it hard to believe that this Congress would further cut the safety net for these children. But that is exactly what the Republican budget would do.

Cuts in the safety net would deny 30,540 children in Texas child care assistance in 2002 and would cut foster care and adoption for vulnerable Texas children by \$359.5 million over 7 years. The House welfare bill would erode the safety net further, cutting child protection for abused and neglected children in Texas by 24 percent in 2002. The Republican budget eliminates \$29.1 million that helps low-income families—and 22,325 children—in Texas with their home heating and cooling bills, and forces families of 204,700 children in Texas to pay more rent. The budget would also eliminate protection for 4,744 children in Texas from drugs and drug-related crimes in public housing and deny 5,092 children the opportunity to move from public housing to renting their own home. Finally, the Republican budget denies assistance to 1,143 homeless children in Texas. The budget cuts homeless assistance by 40 percent in 1996, cutting funding for the homeless in Texas by \$30.3 million in 1996.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here today in disbelief. Disbelief over the fact that Members of this Congress would deny assistance to homeless children, medical care to the disabled, and food to the hungry child. How can they look their children in the eyes, knowing what they are going to do to children like them across the Nation? I fear for the future and I can only hope that my Republican colleagues will come to their senses before it is too late for the children involved. Let there be no uncertainty: the damage they would inflict upon the children of this Nation will last a lifetime and its legacy will last even longer. Therefore, I oppose the Budget Reconciliation Act and will encourage the President to veto it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Let me start off by just answering one of the charges made on the other side and that was that we Democrats did not know what was in here and that we really were all pro-taxes.

Let me just point out this chart that I borrowed from someone else—68.4 percent of middle-income families are going to get a tax increase if that bill passes, or they are going to pay the same. And 64.3 percent of the wealthy people are going to get a tax cut.

Yes, we know what is in it. And that is why we are upset. But let me go to my next chart which is what I planned,

to talk about representing the Committee on the Judiciary. That is, why we ought to call this WRECKconciliation with a "W."

Let me tell Members why. We are doing something to our economy in this bill that I find unconscionable. We are putting a tax on innovation. Innovation is as American as apple pie. What we have done, there was an agreement many years ago that we have really been abiding by and that was the patent and trademark office ought to run on its own fees, that the fees that come in from the inventors should pay for the services and that is it.

Well, guess what we are doing today? WRECKconciliation is tapping into those fees and pulling them out of the patent and trademark office. What that means is obviously the fees are either going to go up or the service is going to go down.

I happen to think that innovation is the basis of the growth of this economy. If we look at the Japanese, they spend \$1,500 for patents and they do not have as many as we do. We now have a fee of \$7,500. Heaven knows what it will be when we get done with WRECKconciliation because every little inventor is going to have to pay more or it is going to take them much longer to get that essential protection out there that they need, and both are wrong.

This is a hidden fee that those of us who sit on Judiciary on the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property on both sides of the aisle really resent. This is one of the many things that are in there.

I also resent the fact that people on the other side of the aisle stand up and say, we do not know what is in it. Does the other side of the aisle know this is in it? Do you know what you are doing here? Do you really want to choke off innovation and patents and the efficient service that we have been seeing? Is it really fair to raise their fees to pay for the debt that came out of general revenues? I do not think so. I hope that we talk about this some more.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means, an individual who has been very instrumental in drafting many provisions of the Medicare and Medicaid part of this legislation.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues believe we should be discussing here today merely a budget bill. I believe that would be inadequate to meet today's demands or our Nation's needs over the next 7 years. I am proud that we are offering here today a budget plan that includes numerous tax reforms that together will help our companies compete in an intensely competitive international market and so assure the millions of jobs these companies provide. It will help small companies grow by providing them better

expensing rights, restore the home office deduction, and make it easier for them to provide pension plans for their employees. The tax provisions in this bill will help middle-class families and put in place the only solution through which we can guarantee our seniors, ourselves, and our children freedom from the fear of the catastrophic costs of long-term care.

This bill expands people's opportunity to gain the education they need to increase their economic power. We extend the right of employers to subsidize the education of their employees. We create the right to develop American dream saving accounts with its flexible rules allowing the use of these savings for education, tax-free. And we create a new research and development tax credit that will help start-up companies, collaborative research efforts, and old-line defense companies create the products of the future. These tax provisions are pro-education, pro-technology, pro-economic growth, pro-family, pro-health care reform.

These tax provisions are just as essential to the well-being of the Nation over the next 7 years as the specific budget provisions of our proposals. Together they plan a path for our Nation to reach a balanced budget by the year 2002 with a healthy economy, strong families and enlightened health and education policy.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget bill. We have heard a lot about the consequences of the \$270 billion in Medicare cuts, but the impact on our States and communities may be even more severe because of the \$182 billion cuts in Medicaid.

Our Nation already faces the challenge of providing health care to 40 million Americans who are uninsured. This Congress should be working on that problem. Instead, we are voting on a repeal of Medicaid that would add 8.8 million people to the list of the uninsured.

Texas will be one of the hardest hit States, and this bill makes matters worse because of a funding formula that does not adequately account for population growth and poverty levels. Altogether, Texas would lose \$11 billion over the next 7 years under this Medicaid repeal, a 29 percent reduction in 2002 alone. Even if Texas could absorb half the cuts by reducing services, it would still have to eliminate coverage for 687,000 people by the year 2002.

No formula will correct the inequity of the repeal of the individual entitlement of Medicaid. It is mathematically impossible.

This Republican plan would force Texas to eliminate coverage for about 43,000 elderly people needing long-term



care. Without Medicaid, families of the elderly and disabled could not afford nursing home care that costs an average of \$38,000 a year.

The Republican Medicaid repeal would force Texas to eliminate coverage for 394,000 children in the year 2002. Currently, 20 percent of children in Texas rely on Medicaid for their basic health needs, including immunizations, regular checkups and intensive care in case of emergencies. They get top-quality care at such facilities as Hermann Hospital and Texas Children's Hospital at the Texas Medical Center in my district. But this guarantee of care would be gone under the Republican plan.

Texas could avoid these difficulties but only by increasing its own spending on Medicaid by 48 percent by raising taxes and cutting other critical programs such as education.

Hospitals in my district would also be hard hit by this Medicaid repeal. The Harris County Hospital District, the Nation's sixth largest, will lose between \$350 million and \$422 million over the next 7 years. Hermann Hospital will lose \$112 million, and Texas Children's Hospital will lose \$100 million.

This plan is wrong. It is wrong to cut this plan to pay to tax cuts for the rich.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD], another distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy said it best back in 1961. "Our true choice is not between tax reductions on the one hand and the avoidance of large Federal deficits on the other. It is clear that an economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough revenues to balance the budget, just as it will never produce enough jobs or profits."

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy was right. The bill before us today is about two things: one, eliminating the deficit and balancing the budget for our children and grandchildren; and, two, providing jobs and opportunities for all Americans with the tax stimulus provisions of the bill.

Economist after economist came to our Committee on Ways and Means testifying about job creation. One economist testified 1.4 million new jobs will be created over the next 5 years from the capital gains tax cut. As he put it, the capital gains tax reductions will stimulate economic activity, increase jobs, capital spending and capital formation, improve national savings, increase entrepreneurship and raise economic output.

Mr. Chairman, we are hearing a lot from the other side about capital gains tax cuts being a tax break for the rich. Let us talk about the facts. An IRS analysis of 1993 tax returns found 77

percent of the tax returns reporting capital gains were filed by taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$75,000, 77 percent; and 60 percent had adjusted gross incomes of less than \$50,000, hardly the rich in America.

But even more impressive than any of these statistics was a young man in my district. When I talked to a high school assembly, a 17-year-old young man from the least affluent part of my district came up to me afterward, and he said, "Ramstad, I liked what you said about capital gains."

I was not accustomed to such feedback from 17-year-old high school students. I asked him, "Young man, do you have any capital gains?" He looked back at me and his eyes got about this big and he said, "No, not now, Ramstad, but someday I hope to."

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of incentive we have to restore to the Tax Code in this country.

All Americans, Mr. Chairman, will benefit from this bill. Let us keep faith with the American people. Let us balance the Federal budget. Let us pass budget reconciliation because the taxpayers of America deserve nothing less.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to spend my brief time in talking about an area of this immense and devastating bill that I know firsthand, Medicaid. My ideas about Medicaid did not come from theory or books. I know it. I lived it.

Twenty-eight years ago, I went from being a married woman with complete health care coverage for my children to being a single mother with three small children receiving no child support and working at a job that initially provided no health care coverage for my three kids. Overnight, a simple checkup became an impossible luxury in our household. I will never, never forget what it was like, Mr. Chairman, to lie awake at night worried to death that one of my children would get sick.

Thankfully, I was able to turn to Medicaid and other forms of public assistance to add to my salary so I could provide my children with the health care, child care, and food they needed.

Mr. Chairman, that safety net is what helped my family get back on their feet. But I will never, not for 1 minute, think that just because my family made it, so can the millions of families who are in similar or worse situations than we were today.

That is why I am so outraged by Speaker GINGRICH's assault on Medicaid. The Speaker and his allies are taking health care from our children. In fact, they are cutting \$182 billion to help pay for \$245 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest special interests.

In my home State of California alone, almost 470,000 children on Medicaid will lose their health care coverage

under this plan. Twenty-eight years ago, Mr. Chairman, that would have been my three children.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, for 40 years, the Republicans in the House have been trying to demonstrate how they differ from Democrats on the role of government in the lives of the American people. The true difference between Republicans and the Democrats is that the Republicans want less government and for Americans to keep what they earn. Democrats want more government and as much tax money as they can get so they can run a social engineering experiment from Washington, DC.

Now, for the first time in many, many years, we have the opportunity to give back to the American people some of the hard-earned dollars they have been sending to the bureaucrats in Washington. That is exactly what the tax cuts in this reconciliation bill does, give something back to the taxpayers so that they can decide for themselves how best to spend and invest their hard-earned dollars.

The Democrats are not going to agree with me, but the vast majority of the American people agree that our Government taxes too much and spends too much.

□ 1815

Even the President recently said, after he pushed through the largest tax increase in history, it was too much. Now, with this bill, we have the chance to help the President by rolling back two-thirds of the tax revenues and the tax increase he started and started to put through on the American people in 1993, with the largest tax increase in history.

The main thing wrong with this bill is we should be rolling back President Clinton's 1993 tax increase in its entirety. Unlike the President, we are keeping our word by providing tax cuts for all Americans while the Democrats will proclaim their worn-out class warfare chant that these are tax cuts for the rich. The truth is the biggest individual tax income tax cuts as a percentage of taxes paid go to taxpayers earning \$30,000 to \$75,000 annually.

So when you hear the Democrats whine and complain about our tax cut and budget balancing bill, remember they are really opposed to our efforts to shift power from the Federal Government to individual Americans.

The American people should be proud of what we are about to do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of the words of the late Justice Hugo Black: "Great nations, like great men, should keep their word." A provision in the bill before us today makes

a mockery of this noble guiding principle.

The proposed tax on tribal gaming income breaks innumerable promises. It violates U.S. treaty obligations, ignores the U.S. Constitution, circumvents the new Republican rules of House procedure—and, it flies in the face of common sense.

Indian tribes are sovereign entities with the power to govern themselves. They have the right to engage in and regulate their own economic activity, and as such, are immune from Federal income tax. From the first days of this country's existence, Congress has recognized the sovereign status of Indian tribes. The U.S. Constitution recognizes tribal sovereignty. And the U.S. Government, in over 500 treaties, has recognized Indian tribes as sovereign entities.

How can the Ways and Means Committee presume to overturn 200 years of Federal law and policy by treating tribes, not as nations, but as corporations?

Further, how dare they do this without a single hearing, a single notice, or a single opportunity for public, administration, legislative, or tribal comment? This is not due process. This is not the democratic way. In fact, it's not even the Republican way. The new majority promised not to institute new taxes without careful study. They even passed a rule requiring a supermajority, three-fifths vote, to raise taxes. Is this new rule to be abandoned so soon? Mr. Chairman, this body's historical memory seems to be getting shorter by the day.

There is another reason Republicans should reject this proposed new tax. The provision will defeat the ability of tribes to become economically self-sufficient. Tribal gaming presents a singularly viable opportunity to eliminate the horrendous poverty on Indian lands. All profits from tribal gaming must go to meet the needs of tribal people. In other words, revenues can only be used for governmental or charitable purposes, such as: education, housing, health care, police, fire departments, child care, roadbuilding, and sanitation. Greater tribal self-sufficiency means less cost to the Federal Government. Indian gaming represents an opportunity to get tribal members off of welfare rolls. The proposed Republican tax is just plain bad economics.

Let me take this chance to correct a myth. The economic success of the Pequot Tribe's gaming operations in Connecticut is the exception, not the rule. The perception that all Indians are gaining great personal wealth from gaming could not be further from the truth. In fact, across the entire country, only one other tribe besides the Pequots are paying significant per capita payments to their members. These members already pay Federal income tax on every cent distributed.

To a degree, gaming has helped alleviate the long-term problems faced by

Indian nations. But most Indian people and children in the United States still live below the poverty line. This Congress has recommended serious reductions in appropriations for Federal programs for Indians. Imposing an illegal, reckless, and suffocating tax on top of these cuts is cruel. It is also self-defeating. We are obliged to treat tribes with due respect. We are obliged to meet our treaty and trust responsibilities. We ought to be helping tribes that help themselves. We must keep our promises. My colleagues, reject this bogus tax.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of comments tonight about how we cannot balance the budget while providing tax relief to the American people. You know, I think we cannot balance the budget without providing tax relief to the American people, because it is not just balancing the budget, it is reorienting the way the Federal Government relates to the rest of American society, lightening the burden of Government on people.

As we disempower the Federal Government to some extent, we have got to reempower the private institutions of society, families, so that they can raise their children, individuals, so that they can invest in their own future, small businesses, so that they can create jobs. But we hear tonight, well, we cannot, because that means we are going to have to cut the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, we are not cutting the Federal budget. It is growing under our plan over 7 years at 2.8 percent a year, at the rate of inflation. What people are saying who do not want the tax relief is we have to deny tax relief to the American people so that the Federal Government can grow faster than the rate of inflation over the next 7 years, as if the American people were undertaxed.

Mr. Chairman, in 1952, the average American family paid 2.5 percent of its income in Federal taxes of all kinds. That same average family today pays 25 percent, or 10 times as much, of its income in Federal taxes, and people are saying they do not need tax relief so the Federal Government can grow faster than the rate of inflation.

If people paid taxes at 1970 levels, they would have \$4,000; the average family earning in the \$40,000 range would have \$4,000 a year more in disposable income.

Mr. Chairman, the reconciliation bill which is before the House today is a good bill. It balances the budget in 7 years. It is the least that we ought to do, and we need tax relief for the American people so that they can do what they do so well for themselves, for their families, for their communities, and for this country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget debate today is or really should be about people, and the whole purpose of government should be to help people.

So what does the Republican reconciliation bill do to people? First, children get hurt. Three million children will lose their health care coverage through Medicaid, 2 million children will have their school lunches cut, 1 million babies and their mothers lose Healthy Start, a prenatal health care, 700,000 disabled children will be denied SSI benefits, 180,000 preschool children will not get Head Start. That is for starters. Teenagers and students trying to get an education so they can be part of the American dream are hurt, too. Four million high school and college-age Americans will lose summer jobs; 50,000 young people will lose the opportunity to earn money for college through AmeriCorp's national service. Two million students will be denied Pell grants, and about 30 million students will have their college loans cut.

Finally, working families get hurt as well. Fourteen million working families will have their taxes raised directly, all of those families having \$25,000 a year or less of income, many of them working at minimum wage, many of them trying to raise their children on those kinds of incomes. And a real sleeper, an estimated 13 million workers will have their pensions raided by their employers, money that they paid out of their salaries to provide for their retirement.

So why are we then voting on such extreme and vicious legislation? Well, basically because all of those cuts taken together, all of them taken together allow the Republicans to provide more than \$100 billion of tax cuts for fewer than 5 percent of Americans, those people making more than \$100,000 per year. That is who the Republicans care about.

Well, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], said earlier 59 percent of the people who report capital gains have income under \$50,000. What he did not bother to say was that that almost two-thirds of all Americans who are in families whose incomes are less than \$50,000 per year, that they get less than 10 percent of all the capital gains. That is typical of this bill. That is who the Republicans care about.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, when the earned income tax credit was enacted in 1975, its concept was to help families move from welfare to the work force by

increasing their after-tax earnings and providing relief from the burden of payroll taxes.

Since then, three legislative revisions have expanded the program's cost tenfold to almost \$25 billion a year and rising. The Democrat's philosophy, as usual, was if a little is good, then a whole lot must be better. As a result, the EITC is the fastest growing cash assistance program in the Federal budget. The current spending trends simply aren't sustainable.

If we are to preserve the EITC for working poor families who most need its benefits, we must reform it to slow down the program's fantastic growth rate. Even the Clinton administration knows this. In the budget President Clinton submitted to Congress this year, he proposed denying the EITC to families with more than \$2,500 in dividend and interest income. Why? because the EITC eligibility criteria excludes many sources of income that families now receive. As a result, some families with incomes as high as \$70,000 a year are eligible for the credit.

Also, we should not give the EITC to childless workers. For 18 of the EITC's 19-year existence, both Republicans and Democrats agreed its benefits should go to working families with dependent children, because the whole purpose of the EITC was to help working families with young children stay off the welfare rolls.

Under our proposal, low-income working parents who support their children will see their tax credit rise substantially. This increase, coupled with our \$500 per child tax credit, will go a long way to helping American families get back on their feet and provide for their children.

Even the Clinton administration agrees that in order to preserve and protect this program for the working families who need its benefits, we must reform it to slow down the rate of growth. I urge my fellow Members to help us preserve and protect the earned income tax credit for American families.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time on our side this evening to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who is the ranking Democrat member on the Committee on Resources, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to manage that time and yield time to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, already this evening Americans have begun to learn the tragic manner in which this legislation treats the elderly and treats our students and treats our children and the poor of this

country, and that is a shame, and it is tragic. It is embarrassing for the Congress to do that to its citizens.

But there is much more in this legislation, because this legislation is being used to hide a whole series of decisions by the Republicans in the Committee on Resources to just be lavish and to lard on taxpayer subsidies to a whole series of industries that cannot justify them, do not need them, and that this Congress has voted against extending those subsidies time and again.

So what have the Republicans chosen to do? They chose to fold them into the reconciliation bill so they will not be visible to the public, so the public will not be aware of the fact that the decision has been made by the Republicans to continue to give away public lands at essentially no cost to mining companies, to foreign-owned mining companies, and let them extract billions of dollars of gold, silver, and platinum from the public lands owned by the taxpayers.

The House of Representatives has voted time and again against that provision. It has voted twice this year not to allow that to happen. But that is in this reconciliation bill because the Republicans cannot tear themselves away from that type of corporate welfare.

We see that they do the same thing with the grazers, people using the public lands to graze cattle. In this legislation we are giving reduced fees when, in fact, the recommendation by GAO and others is that they should be increasing those fees for the use of those public lands, that they do not pay what people pay on private land, but this bill continues the subsidies to those individuals.

This bill sells off the forest lands of some of the largest ski resorts in this country, and it does not guarantee that the American public will continue to have access to areas like Aspen and Vail and other areas of recreation. No, it turns them into a private domain. That is what this bill does.

Why does it do it in this legislation? Because that legislation cannot win a majority of the vote on this House standing alone, just as the deepwater royalty subsidies that have been inserted into this legislation in the Senate were turned down in this House, turned down in the Senate. In this legislation, you cannot amend them out, take them out.

So they lavish hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies to the largest and richest oil companies in the world.

Who pays for those subsidies? The children that you heard about earlier, the poor people in this country, the elderly with their health care. That is who pays for those subsidies.

We continue to see the Committee on Resources just go after and continue to lavish taxpayer subsidies on industry after industry where there is no demonstrated financial need for that subsidy but simply doing it because they did it.

□ 1830

We could not even tear ourselves away from providing double subsidies, where we provide water subsidies to irrigators in the West, and they grow subsidized crops with the subsidized water. We tried to say pick one subsidy. Do not double dip us.

No, that was not good enough. Again, this House has voted numerous times to end that practice, but it is in this reconciliation bill, because they know that if it was brought to the House floor by itself, it in fact would be turned down by this Congress and by this House, because the water subsidies have been turned down, the grazing subsidies have been turned down, the royalty provisions have been turned down, on a bipartisan basis in the last several months in this House. So they put them all together, and then they put them into the bill, and there is no amendments allowed, it is up or down tomorrow.

Corporate welfare for the western extractive industries worth billions of dollars is maintained in this legislation, and it will be reported off of the House floor tomorrow.

Of course, then there is the granddaddy, and that is giving away the Arctic Wildlife Refuge in this legislation. Once again, that provision cannot pass on the floor of the House of Representatives as a freestanding bill. They say it is an emergency; that we must open up the Arctic Wildlife Refuge for oil drilling because America imports half of its oil.

Well, they also have legislation here to make sure that we allow the export of Alaskan oil to Japan and to other countries on the Pacific rim, so it is not for America, it is for their corporate clients.

It is for the opening up of these kinds of areas, and they cannot only do it in a reconciliation bill. They cannot do this in a freestanding bill, because these provisions, these provisions, cannot stand the light of day, they cannot stand the scrutiny of the taxpayers, they cannot stand the scrutiny of our constituents, and that is why they are in this legislation.

This legislation is an absolute Christmas tree. This is absolutely a Christmas tree of gifts to special interests in the form of corporate welfare. The tragedy is that every dollar that is given away to mining companies and to irrigators and to grazers and timber companies, is paid for by Mr. and Mrs. America. It is paid for by people paying the payroll taxes, paid for in reduced Medicare benefits, paid for in reduced Head Start and reduced education. That is the tragedy of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is supposed to reduce the deficit, cut the cost of Government, and protect taxpayers from waste.

But the resources portion of this bill is truly Christmas in October—a legislative rummage sale of valuable Federal assets at bargain basement prices that runs rampant over the environmental laws of our country.

Many of those who implore us to run Government like a business are leading the fight to give away these public resources.

The bill breaks with over 30 years of law and policy and opens the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil development. And we may not even get the money. This bill breaks a legal agreement with Alaska that could reduce revenues to one-tenth the amount projected. And why are we doing this in reconciliation? Surely not because of the need for energy independence: this House just passed—at the urging of ANWR proponents—legislation to allow the export of Alaska oil.

This bill's phony mining reform package would make the Mineral Kings blush. Not 2 years ago, this House voted for real mining reform that would impose a real royalty for the first time, raising \$540 million over 7 years and initiating the cleanup of contaminated abandoned mine sites. This phony reform raises a total of \$76 million over 7 years, virtually none of it from a royalty, which is so laden with deductions and exemptions that any mining company that pays it should fire its accountant. The House voted three times this year to maintain the moratorium on giving away public mining lands to multinational mining conglomerates. This bill ignores those votes and instead charges the mining company the surface value only, which is like selling Fort Knox for the value of the roof.

This bill contains an absolute sham reform of national parks concessions, an irresponsible plan that makes a mockery of the true bipartisan concessions reform that was approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 386–30 just last year. This sham reform locks in the current concessionaires—who have enjoyed bargain basement contracts.

This bill orders the Government to sell national forest lands used as ski resorts—places like Vail and Aspen—to monopoly bidders, promoting the intensive development of these lands and potentially closing access to millions of Americans. Why is this in reconciliation? It violates PAYGO by increasing direct spending and locks in place the ski industry's fee schedule that GAO says fails to provide a fair return to taxpayers.

This bill has a phony reform of Federal grazing policy that lets cattle graze for discount rates on public lands—far cheaper than on adjacent State or private lands. Antireform leaders pretend this has something to do with family ranching, but they know that just 25 percent of the permittees control 75 percent of the forage, including “wingtip cowboys” like J.R. Simplot, a national brewery, a Japanese land and livestock company, and a national oil company. The House has voted 5 times since 1990 to substantially raise the grazing fee, most recently, in 1993 by a vote of 317 to 106. This bill gives the victory—and the subsidies—to the ranchers.

This is a disgrace, and a very costly disgrace for the American taxpayer. The majority is using tiny so-called savings to qualify for the reconciliation process gigantic changes in resource and environmental law. On ANWR, on mining, on grazing, on concessions—they not only fail to pass stronger provisions, they undermine and repeal vast areas of existing public law before they turn the miners and the grazers and the drillers loose on the public lands.

Now, there is another way to do this: We can reform resource management, protect the

environment, strengthen competition and the free market—and raise serious money. But the majority would rather shill for the exploiters than vote for the taxpayers.

The majority failed to accept Democratic proposals to end below-cost timber sales by the Forest Service that would save \$315 million over 7 years.

The majority voted against ending double subsidies to farmers who receive Federal subsidized water, although the House has voted for this reform time after time. So, we will continue to pay farmers to grow crops we are paying other farmers not to grow—and cost the taxpayers a half billion dollars over 7 years.

Now, why are all these destructive, wasteful policies loaded into a budget reconciliation bill, especially when many of them do not really raise money? Why have the Republicans insisted on including phony reforms when it is readily apparent that, given a fair vote on the floor, the House would be willing—and has been anxious—to vote for real reform? After all, the House has voted against mining patents, against deep water royalty holidays—not under Democratic control, but this year.

I will tell you why this is all loaded into reconciliation.

It is to protect these outrageous, expensive giveaways to corporate interests from real debate and real review. These capitulations to corporate welfare are unacceptable to the American taxpayer and unacceptable to this House: But they can get loaded into a great big reconciliation bill, hidden away from scrutiny and amendment, and then strongarmed through without amendment.

These proposals are in this reconciliation bill because they could not survive on their own on this floor. They cannot stand taxpayer scrutiny. They cannot survive the light of day.

Giveaways to the mining corporations, the ranching corporations, the irrigation conglomerates, the recreation industry. Billions of dollars, our dollars, dollars that belong to the American people, given away without real scrutiny. And the environment gets devastated to boot.

This is a cynical and deceptive act of legislative sleight-of-hand. They are raising pennies, but giving away billions. These provisions alone more than justify a vote against corporate welfare, against the destruction of the environment, and against this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of a colloquy, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] to join me in a colloquy on the earned income tax credit.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend you and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for your outstanding work on reforming the EITC. It is a program that has grown way beyond its original scope and intent, and is in dire need of review.

Having said that, I am very concerned that we have inadvertently devised a formula that could result in a number of low-income working families actually being a net loser compared to current law, even after the enactment of the \$500 per child tax credit.

I know that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is strongly committed to helping the working poor in our country. The gentlewoman has labored diligently for some time now in welfare reform legislation, and I believe that reform of the EITC program goes hand in hand with this work. I believe this EITC problem can be fixed with a very slight modification of a technical change, and I would like to work with the gentlewoman and members of the committee to accomplish that.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California, who has worked very diligently on this problem.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and for his fine work in this area. I want to associate myself with his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to express my concern over the potential negative effects that our much needed and long overdue efforts to reform the earned income tax credit could have on a small number of very low-income working families, and I want to let the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and her colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means know we would very much like to work with them on correcting this problem when the budget reconciliation bill goes to conference.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for their support of our reforms of the earned income tax credit, reforms that are reasonable, that are fair, and that are needed; but also to their pointing to a problem that exists in that reform, in that it does actually disadvantage a small group of people who need that earned income tax credit. We are working on that problem. We are delighted to have the gentlemen work with us. We will have some of that problem before this becomes law. I thank the gentlemen for their interest, concern and leadership.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 1996 budget reconciliation bill. Someone said “wreckonciliation” is really what it is. But today I wanted to especially highlight the impact on the environment and the natural resource area.

This gives rise to a new era of robber barons that were in the 19th century. Now we have the robber barons in the 1990's. They act as if the only good tree is a horizontal tree, and that the creator endowed our Nation with a vast and wonderful resource so the special interests could make a profit.

This legislation sets in motion the wholesale exploitation, the subsidization and degradation of America's natural resource legacy, our children's heritage. We see the imprint of the special interests, including mining, timber, oil, and gas industries, throughout the Republican budget measure.

The decision totally destroyed the Arctic Natural Wildlife Refuge [ANWR], by permitting oil and gas exploration and drilling, stands out as the spirit in which this law is being written. This last great piece of arctic wilderness, the arctic plain, is the home to the 160,000 member porcupine caribou herd, where the calves are born, right on the Arctic plain. Beyond that, of course, the grizzlies, the polar bears, the arctic foxes, the conspicuous and inconspicuous fauna and flora abound in this area, an area that has been untouched since the ice age.

But that is not stopping the robber barons in 1995. The majority of the American people, both on CNN and other polls, two to one oppose this action. But that does not have any impact. We disregard the polls. We disregard the people when you take a policy like this forward. You disregard the scientific information. Everything is shunted aside. No consideration, no deliberation. The Republican policy makers know best, push instant gratification for oil development and speculative leasing.

That is what we need, a few more leases sitting, they are not doing anything with, but do not let that bother you. This does not stop with Alaska. It goes on to grazing, it goes on to timber. It lets the park concessionaires take over the park.

What we have here is a great new mountain, a mountain of special interest benefits, a new national monument to the greed and special interest is being built today.

Let us name it what it is, Mount GINGRICH, brought to you by the contract scheme in conjunction with the 1990 robber barons, who ride high in the saddle of the Republican Congress. That is what they are giving to you, the destruction of your legacy.

They are going to worry about the deficit. They are worried about the deficit? They are giving away the resources. They are selling the assets and then score it as if it is money in the bank. They are selling the future of this country, they are selling our natural resources, they are destroying the things that have been built and that have made this country what it is today. But the fact is that everything goes in the name of reconciliation. Well, reconciliation is named right, especially when you spell it w-r-e-c-k,

"wreckconciliation," wrecking the country and destroying our natural resource legacy.

Mr. Chairman, the 1996 budget reconciliation bill environmental provisions continue the tradition of 19th century robber barons who exploited our Nation natural resources and lands. From the bill, one would think the only good tree is a horizontal tree and that the Creator endowed our Nation with vast and wonderful resources so that the special few could make a profit. This legislation sets in motion the wholesale exploitation, subsidization, and degradation of America's natural resource legacy our children's heritage. We see the imprint of special interests, including the mining, timber, oil and gas industries, throughout the Republican budget measure.

The decision to destroy the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge [ANWR] by permitting oil and gas exploration and drilling stands out as the spirit in which this law is being written. The last great piece of American Arctic wilderness, the Arctic plain is home to the 160,000 Porcupine Caribou herd, where the calves are born. Beyond the caribou the grizzly and polar bears, arctic foxes, and numerous other species conspicuous and inconspicuous flora and fauna abound. Opening this refuge area to drilling will guarantee destruction of this Arctic desert wilderness.

The majority of the American people oppose drilling for oil in ANWR. A CNN poll conducted in September showed two-thirds of the respondents opposed opening up ANWR for exploration. A more recent poll conducted by Deardourff/The Media Group in mid-October confirmed the CNN findings. Those polled strongly believe ANWR is a unique area that must be protected and they opposed drilling in the Arctic Refuge by a margin of almost 4 to 1. Despite the overwhelming public support for protecting ANWR, the Republican leadership has refused to pull this specific provision from the reconciliation bill or permit a vote. The polls are disregarded. The scientific information is shunted aside no consideration—no deliberation. The GOP policy makers who know best push instant gratification for oil development, and speculative leasing takes priority over common sense.

The egregious provisions of this legislation do not end at the Alaska border. The bill gives private park concessionaires in our National Parks control over the National Park itself and the NPS stewards. Grazing permit fees on public lands are reduced below the already scandalously low prices. The so-called mining reform provisions are nothing but a sham. Selling the land at fair market value for the surface without consideration of the value of the minerals enshrines into law for the mining industry yet another subsidy at American taxpayer expense at the cost of our natural heritage. While the Republican majority leadership has determined to slash education, health care, and other social spending for the children, the poor and the elderly, they have piled on the corporate welfare in the natural resources provisions of this budget reconciliation bill into a new mountain of special interest benefits—a new national monument to greed and the special interests is being built today. Let's name it what it is, Mount GINGRICH, brought to you by the contract scheme in conjunction with the new 1990's robber barons who ride high in the saddle of this good Congress.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the reconciliation package.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995. As the name implies, this package of reforms outlines a clear path to a balanced budget in the year 2002. We promised the American people that we would bring the budget to balance in 7 years and tomorrow we plan to deliver on that promise. While balancing the budget in itself is an admirable goal, our bill does much more, including: reforming our broken welfare system, providing needed tax relief for American families, saving Medicare from certain bankruptcy, restructuring Medicaid so States can meet their own specific needs, and many other reforms that ensure that the legacy we leave our children is debt free and full of opportunity, rather an ever increasing Federal deficit and a bloated, more intrusive Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the various committee's that worked diligently to complete this package of long needed reforms. I look forward to a productive debate that will show the American people that their elected representatives can act in a responsible manner for the future of our country.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest challenge to this Congress is its deficit and the greatest threat to this Nation is its national debt. I believe it was Mr. Jefferson, one of our Founding Fathers, that said a democracy is indefinite because those who are governed under a democracy will learn of the benefits it can reap from its treasury and it will vote for people who will enhance those benefits.

Well, our democracy is in jeopardy. We are spending some \$500 million a day now more than we take in to help pay for benefits that have been enhanced by this Congress. The reconciliation bill will change this. It will end the deficit spending by balancing the people's books. It will change welfare from the current welfare system, a system which is out of control, a system which has spent \$5 trillion over the last 30 years creating a dependency of benefits on the people's treasury, a welfare system that is anti-family and is anti-work.

The budget reconciliation bill will reduce welfare dependency. It will limit cash, cash for having children out of wedlock, cash for misbehavioral children, cash for drug addicts and alcoholics. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it limits cash to able-bodied, irresponsible parents. But it does one other thing; it still provides health care, nutrition and child care for unfortunate children.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this body, support ending the addiction

that we have created to the public's budget, the people's Treasury. Support balancing the people's books. Vote for the Budget Reconciliation Act.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vehement opposition to the reconciliation bill before us tonight, and in particular to the provisions of title IX as reported by the Resources Committee. As I am the ranking Democrat on the Mining Subcommittee, I will restrict my comments to the energy and mineral resources portions of the bill.

Let me start by saying that Jesse James never had it so good. The sham mining law reform package included in this bill will make it easier to steal gold—and oil and gas—from the American taxpayer than even Jesse, Butch Cassidy, and the Sundance Kid could have ever possibly hoped for or imagined.

Under the Mining Law of 1872, signed by President Ulysses S. Grant, gold miners can gain fee simple title to Federal gold, silver, and other minerals and the land containing them upon payment of a nominal sum: \$2.50 or \$5 an acre. Supporters of the bill before us will profess that their bill will change this situation. But instead it merely replaces a bad system with 1 which is no better.

The Republicans will boast that their proposal will require that mineral-rich lands be priced at fair market value. But, what they won't tell you is that, under their bill, the land will be sold for the value of the surface without consideration for mineral values. It makes no sense to sell our minerals for a pittance of their intrinsic value—it would be like selling a bottle of Dom Perignon for the price of the cork.

Under the Kasich substitute, the Department will be forced to fast track approval of the 233 patent applications in the pipeline, and give away as much as 15.5 billion dollars' worth of gold and silver and reserve no royalty whatsoever.

To be fair, we should note that the Republican bill would reserve a royalty on hard rock minerals mined on Federal lands for the first time in this Nation's history. Unfortunately, due to the way the Republican majority drafted the bill, it will not raise any money.

And, it didn't have to be that way. In the February 1995 budget estimates, CBO scored the 8-percent net smelter return royalty, previously passed by the House with a 3 to 1 margin, as raising \$90 million per year; over 7 years, that equals \$540 million—with one year for transition.

The Republicans will try to tell you that their royalty is the same as the Nevada net proceeds severance tax which raises a lot of money for the State—so their royalty will eventually raise revenues. But, the royalty in their bill is not the same as the Nevada sever-

ance tax. The Republican proposal would allow additional deductions to be made from gross revenues; such as engineering costs, costs of support services and support personnel, environmental compliance, permitting and other administrative costs. Obviously, by decreasing the gross, the royalty will be levied on a far smaller net and thus we will collect far less than is fair.

The Republicans will try to tell you that their royalty will raise revenues in the long term—that after everybody gets their patents and new claims are being staked on Federal lands, that their royalty will be in place and will raise money. But, they won't tell you that all other Federal royalties are charged on gross revenues because net royalties are notoriously difficult to administer and just don't raise all that much money in return. And they won't tell you that according to a review of the Nevada net proceeds tax report for 1992–1993, royalties paid by the Nevada mining industry to private interests averaged 3 percent of gross revenues and 11 percent of net proceeds. In the bill before you, the American taxpayer is getting the short end of the deal—combining the lowest rate with the least value—3.5 percent of net proceeds.

The bill would also change the current \$100 rental fee to a sliding scale fee starting at \$100 for the first years and ending with \$500 for years the claim is held beyond 20 years. But it also allows deduction of up to 75 percent of the costs of developing the claim for mining. In addition, the bill would give away the first year's rental fee. According to CBO, the Republican royalty and holding fee would raise about \$14 million over 5 years. By simply extending the \$100 holding fee, as the Democrats proposed, we would have raised \$33 million in each year—or twice as much in one year as the 5-year total in the Republican proposal.

CBO scores the Republican mining proposal—both royalties and holding fees at a meager \$14 million over 5-years—that averages out at less than \$3 million per year—that's less over 5 years than the royalty we proposed would raise in one year.

The mining reform bill passed by the House in 1993 would have raised real money and still protected vested mining rights on those claims that could not qualify for a patent. The Republican mining proposal before you today enables all 300,000 existing claims to get a patent. All claims that are able to qualify for a patent get out of paying any royalty to the taxpayer in the future.

It's evident to me that their intent is not to raise funds to meet reconciliation or deficit reduction goals, but rather to pass a sham mining law in order to quell the momentum for responsible reform.

#### FEDERAL OIL AND GAS ROYALTIES

The Republican bill also includes a giveaway for big oil. The Santa Fe Reporter said in its October 11 issue:

The result—of the Oil and Gas Royalty Fairness proposal—could be a slashing of untold millions of dollars the state normally uses for schools, highways, and social programs.

The Western States Land Commissioners and the conservative Republican Governor of Wyoming have come out against the proposal.

It doesn't even raise all that much money—in fact it was a money loser when it came out of the Resources Committee. So why include

it? Maybe it has something to do with a fact the bill's sponsors freely admit—that the oil and gas industry had a big hand in writing the bill.

The Republican oil and gas proposal is seriously defective. It would drastically modify the existing statute of limitations on the collection of royalties due taxpayers, and would create dangerous precedents that will diminish the government's ability to collect royalties.

The bill would limit Federal oversight of the lands companies lease for oil and gas. One section would allow marginal leases to operate without paying any royalties.

Also, the bill would change longstanding Federal policy and require the payment of interest to lessees who make overpayments. This change will cost, according to CBO, \$60 million over 7 years, hardly a suitable provision for a reconciliation bill intended to reduce, not expand, Federal deficits.

#### HELIUM PRIVATIZATION

Finally, the helium privatization section adopted by the committee would terminate the Federal helium program. While the ending of the archaic helium program is generally supported, the committee rejected an important amendment I offered to provide assistance to Federal helium employees such as extending life and health insurance, allowing the use of local employment agencies to help place employees, relocation assistance, and governmentwide priority rather than just departmentwide preference in hiring.

CBO advised the committee that the amendment would have had no budgetary effect. Even so, the committee refused to provide this additional assistance to the 200-plus employees and their families who will lose their jobs in Amarillo, TX in the next year. Although there is general agreement that we need to reduce unnecessary functions of government like the helium program, it is unfortunate that the majority was unwilling to provide this assistance to the employees, and their families, who have served their government and taxpayers for many years.

In conclusion, I would reiterate that this is a bad bill because it is abusive to the environment, because it deprives the taxpayers of the value of the resources that belong to them, and because it makes a mockery of the reconciliation and legislative processes. These provisions are illustrative of the willingness of the majority to bow to the special interests represented by lobbyist for resource consumptive corporations at the expense of the national interest and the taxpayers. Severe and in many cases irreparable damage will be done to our Treasury, to our Nation's legacy of natural resources, to our fish and wildlife resources, and to our public lands by passage of this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2517, the budget reconciliation bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] chairman of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address some of the things that have been said on this floor in the recent moments of this debate.

First, I want to stress one thing, in the reconciliation package that came



out of our committee, the Committee on Resources, we addressed the grazing provisions that were mentioned by the gentleman from California. We in fact raised the fees for grazing. I do not see that in their substitute.

The second thing, with what we call the hard rock mining provisions, for the first time we created a royalty provision for the taking of minerals from the so-called public lands. So we have addressed that. We just do not speak out in anger or frustration. We have really tried to do what we think is correct to help balance the budget. We are not giving anything away in this provision which came out of our bill that came to the Reconciliation Act.

I would also like to suggest that there has been more misinformation, more flat out dishonesty, about the Alaskan Oil Reserve in the past, I would say, 6 to 8 months than I have ever experienced in my 22 years here.

We have to keep a little bit of history in mind. In 1980 we set aside 147 million acres of land for single use purpose in the State of Alaska. But the Congress at that time said that we ought to look at the coastal plain, where the oil possibly could be, and then there would be a recommendation by the President whether we should drill. That recommendation came down after a period of time, a period of time, that said yes, the Congress should have leasing for oil on the oil reserve, the so-called ANWR area. There has been 40 days of hearings held since 1978 after the recommendation came down. It is estimated that there is between 3 billion and 30 billion barrels of oil 74 miles away from the existing pipeline.

□ 1845

This area is strongly supported to be leased by the native people of Alaska. Many Members might have had a chance to visit with them. These are people that had little or nothing before the development of oil and now have what they think is their right due off of their land. They have water and sewage and schools and health, which they did not have before.

But more than that, Mr. Chairman, we are now importing \$1 billion a week of foreign oils—\$1 billion per week. It is important that the truth of this matter comes forth. Do not look at the ads and the misinformation that has been conveyed to this body and to the general public. Let us look at this Reconciliation Act as a responsible resource development and protection of the environment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire of the Chair, am I correct that I have 10 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I hear from my constituents that those of us serving in Congress should give the three-way test to all bills. The three-way test that my district holds me accountable for is the three E's, which stand for education, economy, and the environment. This bill fails on all three accounts.

First, it hurts education. It eliminates the 6-month interest subsidy on student loans for new college graduates which will cost students \$3.5 billion. It also caps spending for school lunch and child nutrition programs which help students meet the basic nutritional need.

Second, it hurts the economy. It cuts \$13.4 billion from agricultural programs without reinvesting any of those savings into research or trade, threatening our Nation's critical agricultural industry. It cuts the earned income tax credit which gives millions of Americans incentive to be productive members of our work force. Above all, it cuts programs that encourage trade, research, and development which have the serious impact on our economic growth.

Finally, this bill hurts the environment. The Committee on Resources part of this bill are a fire sale on some of our most precious natural resources. It sells the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge to the oil companies. It sells mountains to the ski resorts, and sells the rivers to the water developers. It sells the trees to the timber cutters. It sells the precious minerals to the mining companies. None of the funds that are derived from these sales get reinvested into the environment. It grabs it all and hides it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also eliminates dozens of programs from the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, including those that study global warming and research on the ocean environment.

This bill does not answer our fiscal problems. Congress has already cut the deficit by \$130 billion and did so without hurting education, without hurting the economy, and without hurting the environment. It also did so without balancing the budget on the backs of the poor and the elderly, yet this bill does exactly that by increasing the cost of Medicare and giving tax relief to the very wealthy.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, the theme of this reconciliation bill is controlling spending. As Republicans have been saying for years, the Federal deficit is driven not by low tax revenues but by too much spending.

A 1992 study by the Joint Economic Committee demonstrated beautifully and tragically that over the last 30 years, every time Congress raised taxes

\$1 we increased spending \$1.59. That demonstrates the problem. So where is all the spending going? Some will argue that it is coming primarily in the defense area. But guess what? Ten years ago, in 1986, we spent \$273 billion on defense. This year we are spending \$272 billion on defense, a billion dollars less than in 1986. And if we factor in inflation, defense spending has actually declined by \$73 billion, or 27 percent in real terms in the last decade.

Mr. Chairman, if the spending increases are not in defense, where are they? A big part of the answer, as shown on this chart, is in the area of Federal spending on means-tested programs that increased dramatically for more than three decades. In constant dollars it grew from less than \$10 billion in 1950 to the incredible sum of \$262 billion this year. And, ladies and gentlemen, that is an increase of 2,600 percent. That is right, 2,600 percent.

Mr. Chairman, according to the bipartisan Kerrey Commission, in their report, they said unless we do something about entitlement spending, in just a few short years entitlement spending, plus interest from the national debt, will consume the entire Federal budget. That is right, not a penny for the three E's, as the gentlemen said. Not a penny for the environment. Not a penny for education. Not a penny for the economy. Not a penny for school loans. Not a penny for defense. Not a penny for our veterans. Not a penny for any of it in the discretionary area unless we deal with the explosion in entitlement spending.

The conclusion to be drawn from these numbers, Mr. Chairman, is understood by almost everyone in America. There are only a few on the other side of the aisle that still fail to appreciate it. The Nation's budget deficit is caused by wild spending increases. These increases have been going on for three decades and it is time to stop them.

This reconciliation vote and this bill is not about the future of the GOP, it is not about the future of the Democratic Party, it is not about the future of who will control this body, but it is about the future of our children. It is about the future of this country. It is about the future of our grandchildren and what kind of opportunity they are going to have and whether they will be saddled with debt. We have the opportunity in this bill to begin to control spending, to control our destiny once again. We have that opportunity within our grasp, let us not let it slip away.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, let me introduce a concept into this discussion that does not often get heard, and that is the concept of justice. Our Republican friends are right when they talk about the serious problem of the national debt and the interest on the



national debt. They are dead wrong in terms of their reconciliation package.

Mr. Chairman, what sense does it make and how are we moving toward a balanced budget when we give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America? How does that help us move toward a balanced budget? How does it help us move toward a balanced budget when we repeal the alternative minimum corporate tax so that the largest corporations in America will end up paying nothing in taxes? Explain to the American people how that moves us toward a balanced budget.

This morning, Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus held a press conference and we documented that if this Congress had the guts to stand up to the large corporations and the wealthiest people in this country and eliminated the \$125 billion a year in corporate welfare that we currently provide, we could move toward a balanced budget in 7 years, but we would not have to slash Medicare, we would not have to slash Medicaid, student loans, fuel assistance, or children's nutrition programs.

There is a way to move us toward a balanced budget which is fair, Mr. Chairman, which does not come down heavy on the poorest and most vulnerable people in this country. Let us have the guts to stand up to the big money interests and move toward a balanced budget in that way.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

(Mr. TALENT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciated my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS' remarks, and there have been a lot of suggestions in the last few minutes about how we should have balanced the budget, but none of those were incorporated in a plan from the other side when they had a chance to offer them.

Another reason to pass this reconciliation bill is because it incorporates the Personal Responsibility Act, the welfare reform bill this House passed in the spring, a bill designed to replace a failed system that is destroying families and neighborhoods in America with a system of assistance that is based on family, that is based on work, and that is based on responsibility.

Why do we need to do that, Mr. Chairman? Let us look at a couple of historical facts. In 1948 in the United States the poverty rate was about 30 percent. It declined steadily all throughout the postwar era until it reached about 15 percent in 1965. And a seminal event occurred in 1965. The Federal Government declared war on poverty.

In the 30 years since that date, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has spent, in means-tested entitlement programs, in Federal spending or Federally mandated State spending, \$5 trillion in transfer of payments from the

middle class to lower income America. And the poverty rate, which was 15 percent in 1965, after 20 years of going down, is 15 percent today. We have bought nothing in terms of a decrease in poverty. What we have bought is a six-fold increase in the out-of-wedlock birthrate.

In 1965, 6 percent of the children born in the United States were born out of wedlock. Today that figure is 32 percent. Why did this happen? Why no poverty decrease but an increase in the out-of-wedlock birthrate? Because, Mr. Chairman, the two most effective anti-poverty programs, proven through generations of experience, through all the scholarship, the two most effective programs are work and family, usually marriage.

The Federal welfare system conditions assistance to poor people on them doing neither of those things. If they work or if they get married, they get no assistance. That is why poverty has not gone down and illegitimacy has gone up. We have taken the kids away from millions of American children and we have given them the Government instead, and we are now living with the result.

Senator MOYNIHAN said, 30 years ago, that a society that does that asks for and gets chaos. And we have chaos in hundreds and hundreds of neighborhoods around the United States where this model predominates.

What do we do in this bill, Mr. Chairman? It is really pretty simple. We take the welfare system and we shift it so that instead of discouraging and penalizing work, we encourage it, and in many cases we require it for able-bodied people because it is good for them and their families. Instead of encouraging illegitimacy, we discourage it by removing the incentives in the welfare package that encourage people to make a decision that is terribly destructive for themselves and for their families. And then we return power over the administrative details of this system to the people, exercised through their State and local authorities.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the last step in welfare reform, it is the first step. We have a long way to go. This lesson has been hard to learn. It has taken us years. We have paid a lot to learn it, and now I hope we learn it. It is important that we pass this bill and the welfare reform in it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, we are past the debate about balancing the budget. Fiscal responsibility has come to Washington, DC. But the question is whose priorities will we use in balancing the budget?

The Republican majority says that we should start out by, first, reducing taxes on the largest most profitable corporations in America, reducing taxes on the wealthy; that we should increase military spending, buy weap-

ons that even the Pentagon does not want, like the B-2 bomber, at \$1.5 billion per copy, a weapon that does not work, has no earthly purpose and the Pentagon does not even want.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we start there then we have to do what they are doing. That means \$10 billion out of student loans. The Republicans are going to cut \$10 billion out of student loans. Members of that party got student loans like I did to get here. The Speaker of the House got student loans to get here.

□ 1900

Now we are going to pull up the ladder and say, "Sorry, we do not have the money anymore." That is absurd. We have got to balance the budget with the right priorities.

Now, it is pathetic. We cannot even tax foreign corporations operating in America. American corporations operating overseas have to pay taxes, but no, the United States of America cannot levy a minimum tax against foreign corporations operating here. They take all their profits out and pay nothing in taxes to this country. That would raise \$25 billion a year. That would offset the cuts in student loans and in the low-income housing tax credit program.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about running the government like a business. If we are running the government like a business, look at the subject before us at this moment, the natural resource policy of the United States of America. Mining royalties, no one else gives away their precious natural resources. No other country on earth, no other landowner, no government; just the United States Government at \$2.50 an acre.

Mr. Chairman, we got \$10,000 last year for a \$20 billion gold mining claim, and we gave it away for \$10,000 to a Canadian company that does not pay taxes in the United States. Is that running Government like a business? This bill would not fix that problem. This bill has a phony, sham mining royalty clause that would raise \$14 million over 7 years. Hey, that is pretty stiff.

The Congressional Budget Office, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], a Republican, says that we could do \$540 million without even drawing a breath, and we would still have plenty of mining activity in the western United States.

New loopholes for the poor and suffering oil and gas industry. You know, they have not been too profitable lately. Actually, they have been quite profitable, but they need new loopholes. Why? Because it is payoff time here. There was an election. There was an expensive election. There is going to be an election. That is going to be an expensive election. Do my colleagues know what? Those PACs, the banking PACs, the mining PACs, the oil and gas PACs, are dumping money into the new majority and they are getting their

payoff right here today. The Republicans are talking about cutting welfare. Cut corporate welfare first.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I will close the debate on our side, and so I am the last speaker and would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to complete his time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just speak briefly in opposition to the reconciliation bill in part because of the opening up of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil drilling.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example of the corporate handouts that the Republicans on the Committee on Resources included in the reconciliation bill. This bill gives away one of the last most valuable pieces of wilderness that the American taxpayer owns, in order to boost up falling revenues in the oil industry. In return we get nothing more than a few dollars we could get anyway if we reform our mining and grazing laws to guarantee a fair return to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, energy security is not the issue. I am a member of the Committee on Resources, but also the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power. I can tell my colleagues that oil consumption is on the rise, but we are not doing the things we need to do to ensure that security. We are not investing in mass transit or renewable fuels research or alternative fuel vehicles. That is the way to ensure our security.

Opening up ANWR will only prolong our addiction to oil. It does nothing to wean the United States of its oil addiction or to wean corporations from the welfare rolls.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when Republican Members are raising Medicare taxes on our seniors to provide a \$270 billion tax break to the wealthiest Americans, I really find it appalling, but not surprising, that the Republicans on the Committee on Resources would include this corporate welfare for the oil, mining, and cattle industries.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman this bill is the most obvious example yet of the long parade of far-right anti-environmental bills that we have had to consider in this Congress.

And this bill is probably the most damaging bill that we have yet to consider because it deals with many complex issues that should have been considered by authorizing committees, not rammed through in this giant bill which is being rammed through the House this week.

As I have said, there are many problems with this bill from the perspective of the environment. But, right now, I want to focus on two of the most important: The opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge [ANWR] and the National Park Service concessions provisions.

#### ANWR—BUDGET BILL ASSUMES SAVINGS FROM ITS DEVELOPMENT

We have been told by the majority party that opening up ANWR is important because the American people support it and industry needs it to create jobs and cut the deficit.

But, this provision is not supported by the American public. As recently as July of this year, a national poll of 1,000 voters found that voters reject the idea of allowing oil drilling in ANWR by more than three to one. In fact, in that poll 57 percent of those surveyed opposed opening up ANWR while only 17 percent favored opening it up.

This same poll also found that when told that revenue from ANWR oil fees would be used to cut the deficit, the numbers went up: Seventy percent said protecting this area should be our first priority and only 20 percent said we should use the fees from oil drilling to reduce the deficit.

The American people do not support opening up the refuge, but it is also important to note that the oil we are told is supposed to be there may not be there after all.

An Interior Department study has found that there is only a 1 in 5 chance of there being any recoverable oil in ANWR at all.

And, even if there is oil there, it has been estimated that full production of this field would likely only provide enough oil to supply the United States for 200 days. How are we going to cut the deficit and create new jobs if there's no oil there? Is the price we'll pay in environmental protection worth that risk?

I ask the House, are we willing to trade away one of the most remarkable natural areas in North America for a few months worth of oil? Are we so desperate for a quick buck that we would sacrifice our natural heritage for a few drops of oil that may or may not be where it's supposed to be? I hope not and I urge a "no" vote on the legislation on these grounds alone.

#### PARK SERVICE CONCESSIONS GIVEAWAYS IN THE BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL

The National Park Service concessions policies included in this reconciliation bill constitute a raid on the wallet of the American taxpayer: This bill specifically allows concessionaires to set their own prices and rates unless there is no competition in or near the parks.

This bill gives concessionaires greater protection than current law by severely limiting the ability of the Secretary of Interior from raising fees for concessionaires.

This bill writes a blank check to current Park Service concessionaires by setting the standards for contract re-

newal at such a simple level that competition for concessions will be effectively silenced.

I did not think that the lesson of the 1994 elections was less competition, reduced returns to the Treasury and a bigger backlog of park problems to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, the budget reconciliation bill is a sham for the Treasury, a travesty for the environment and a disaster for the American people. I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow we will come back and we will resume this debate, but perhaps it is a good point, at the midpoint of this debate, to stop and take stock of where we are and ask this basic fundamental question: Why do we do this?

Earlier it was pointed out, it was said in the words of the Contract With America, "Promises made, promises kept." But these were not promises that were made behind some closed door with some special interest group out of view of the American people, which is all too often the way it used to be done. These were promises that were made out there on the west steps of this Capitol; promises that were made in the full light of the American people.

They were promises that were put down on paper. They were promises that were made in a Contract With America that was printed in national publications.

They were promises that were repeated in town halls in stump speeches across the Nation. They were promises that were written down in campaign brochures. All of America could see them. They were there for all the world to see.

Mr. Chairman, there is a more fundamental reason for doing this than promises made, and promises kept. We do this, we do this reconciliation for the young people of America. The young people who have a right to their future, as my generation grew up knowing that we had a bright future for us.

We do it for the working Americans of this country who have a right to be able to provide for their families. And, yes, Mr. Chairman, we do it for the senior citizens of this country who have a right to live out their lives in dignity.

The sad fact is, Mr. Chairman, Washington has been lying to these people all too long. We have lied to senior citizens by telling them we could increase their benefits and their payments and the programs that were available to them without suffering the consequences of inflation.

We lied to working Americans by telling them we cared about their families, but then we denied them the wherewithal to provide for those families. Today, we see the evidence around us, the evidence litters the landscape with broken and shattered families.

We just plain lied to young people. We heaped debt on them and scorned them because by and large they did not vote and now the bill comes due for them.

The sad fact is that more Americans believe in unidentified flying objects and UFO's than believe that Generation X will ever see one dime out of their Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, this is a moral crisis. This is a moral obscenity. We have broken the link of trust between generations in this country. But today, tomorrow, we can begin to restore, to repair that link, to restore that trust.

Mr. Chairman, we can do it with this reconciliation bill, which makes deeper changes to Government than anything we have done on the floor of this House in the last 60 years. But it is not a wrecking ball, it is a mason's trowel, carefully reworking and rebuilding the walls and the floors, the doors and the windows of this edifice.

At the end, what we will see is a castle, a castle that is good to live in for all Americans; a castle built on a sound fiscal foundation; a castle that is lighted with the shining light of compassion and caring by all those who live within it; a castle that is filled with hope, because there is opportunity for all to grow, to have a better life.

This, Mr. Chairman, is what it is about. It is about our future. It is probably, the most important vote in the careers of any of us here, no matter how long we have been here or how many more years we will stay.

We are often accused of casting our votes for today's special interests and for tomorrow's votes, but today we have a historic opportunity to do something different; to cast our vote for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I know we will do the right thing. We will vote for the dignity of senior citizens. We will vote for the opportunity of working Americans. We will vote for our children's future. We will vote to pass this reconciliation bill tomorrow.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this legislation. I do not disagree with the goal of reducing the Federal deficit. I do, however, disagree with the way in which this legislation attempts to achieve that goal.

Some changes in Federal programs are necessary in order to control Federal spending and bring the budget under control, but this legislation makes deep cuts in programs that help average Americans—programs like Medicare, Medicaid, the earned income tax credit, and the low-income housing credit—in order to pay for \$245 billion in tax cuts that will disproportionately benefit the wealthy. I find such a trade-off totally unacceptable.

Last week the House passed legislation cutting \$270 billion from the Medicare Program. This legislation has since been incorporated into the reconciliation bill before us today. This legislation makes cuts that are much deeper than those necessary to keep Medicare viable over the next 10 years. Most Democrats, myself included, supported an alternative Medicare reform package that would have made only \$90 billion in cuts in Medicare, but which

would have kept the program solvent for the same period of time. The reason the Republicans want to make \$180 billion in additional Medicare cuts is that they need the extra savings if they are going to balance the budget and pay for their tax cuts.

For the same reason, they plan to cut Medicaid by \$180 billion over the next 7 years. The Republican plan would block grant Medicaid and transfer control over the program to the States. While the bill before us today does increase spending on Medicaid, it does so at a rate that is not sufficient to keep up with the program's anticipated increases in caseload and health care costs. The net result will most likely be an increase in the number of uninsured people in this country, a lower quality of health care for those who are still covered by Medicaid, and an increase in cost-shifting—transferring the burden of paying for health care for the poor from the Federal Government to other patients with private health insurance.

This legislation also makes \$22 billion in cuts to the earned income tax credit. These cuts will affect 14 million working families—three quarters of all current recipients of the EITC. These people need tax relief more than most families, and yet, they will have less disposable income than under current law if this legislation is adopted in its current form. Marginal tax rates for many of these families will increase by more than 2 percentage points if this legislation is passed. This appears to be the only case where Republicans are unconcerned about the effect of increased marginal tax rates on work decisions; apparently, if you do not make much money, you do not deserve their sympathy.

The impact of the proposed changes in the EITC would be compounded by the welfare reform provisions contained in this legislation. Taken together, these provisions would have a devastating impact on people on the margins of the work force, many of whom are already working full-time at minimum wage and are still unable to make ends meet. The welfare reform bill passed by the House earlier this year would force single mothers off welfare after 2 years without adequate health care or child care assistance in many cases. Thanks to the cuts in the EITC, welfare mothers who eventually manage to find a job—or several jobs—and earn less than \$30,000 would have less disposable income than under current law. Are these policies the mark of a family friendly Congress? I do not think so. The EITC provides a positive alternative to welfare by making work pay. Apparently, now that the Republicans have succeeded in cutting welfare dramatically, they no longer see any need to maintain such a generous work incentive. Social Darwinism has returned with a vengeance.

And, of course, that is not all. The Republican reconciliation bill would phase out the low-income housing credit as well. This credit has helped provide affordable housing for more than 800,000 low-income families. Without the continuation of this credit, less affordable housing will be available for these families, and they will have to spend more of their meager income on housing.

And to make matters even worse, the Republican reconciliation bill contains language that would allow companies to withdraw to \$40 billion from their employees' pension funds over the next 5 years. This action could jeop-

ardize or reduce the pension benefits of millions of working-class families. It looks as if the Republicans want to make certain that if families do work hard, struggle to get ahead, and manage to land a job with a pension, they would not enjoy the fruits of their labors when they retire.

All of the cuts I have mentioned would fall disproportionately on the working poor, the elderly, and poor children. Are these really the groups we want to bear the burden of deficit reduction? Are these folks really failing to hold up their end of our social contract? Are the affluent families that will benefit most from this reconciliation bill's tax cuts the families most in need of assistance?

By all means, Congress should address the deficit, and the Federal Government should provide the most hard-pressed American families with a little tax relief. What amazes me is that the Republican party believes that the 10 or 20 percent of households in this country with the highest incomes are the families most in need of government assistance. It seems as if the Republicans consistently attempt to solve society's problems at the expense of the most vulnerable members of our communities.

I find such actions reprehensible and short-sighted. They certainly undermine Republican professions of concern for children and the family. The policies in this bill will do more to destroy communities and hurt children than all the excesses—real and imagined—of the New Deal and the Great Society combined. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 24, 1995, all time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOEHNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 2491), to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 2491, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### SUPPORT AN ENLARGED NAFTA TO ENSURE COMPETITIVENESS OF AMERICAN EXPORTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to continue the discussion which began in a joint subcommittee hearing of the House International Relations Committee on trade issues regarding Chile and other Latin American countries in light of the North American Free Trade Act [NAFTA] experience.

No doubt, we will continue to hear a plethora of statistics and anecdotes about the benefits and costs of NAFTA as well as increasing information about the benefits and costs of Chile's possible accession to that agreement. As a Member, I strongly supported NAFTA. Now, I strongly support Chile's accession to NAFTA. In fact, this Member said at the time, and will repeat it here today, that in a straightforward economic decision, it would have been more appropriate to accept Chile into a free-trade agreement with the United States even before Mexico because of Chile's dramatic economic progress and liberalization.

It is very easy to get lost in all the statistics about the benefits of NAFTA or Chile's accession. But those statistics don't reveal one thing. One should ask: "What would have happened if we had not passed NAFTA?"

There can be no doubt that many American companies have relocated to Mexico recently. Undoubtedly, many Americans have lost their jobs to

cheaper Mexican labor. But that does not mean that many Americans would have kept their jobs if we had not adopted NAFTA. No, instead, Americans would have lost many low-wage jobs to Southeast Asia, South Asia, and other parts of Central and South America. This situation has been greatly exacerbated by the peso crisis in Mexico which itself, this Member emphasizes, was in no way caused by the NAFTA agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when this body courageously adopted the Uruguay Round implementing legislation, this Member said that many opponents of that historic trade legislation were in essence saying, "Stop the world, I want to get off." Well, this Member stands by that comment and believes it still applies here today.

The simple truth is that the United States, and the American people, have no good economic choice but to push for expansion of NAFTA gradually and appropriately to the entire Western Hemisphere or risk being excluded from a rapidly liberalizing world economy. Economic integration and trade liberalization is occurring in nearly every part of the world including Europe, Asia, and South America.

For example, the European Union [EU] has already created the world's largest free-trade zone and has recently expanded this block by adding three members of the European Free Trade Association (Austria, Finland, and Sweden). The EU's single market includes 369 million consumers and a gross domestic product [GDP] of about \$6.3 trillion (1993). This "Fortress Europe," as some call it, is seeking to add the low-wage Eastern European economies of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia by the year 2000 and the North African and Middle Eastern countries of Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Israel by the year 2010. Together, this free-trade zone of low-wage labor Eastern European and Mediterranean countries and such high-tech, high-wage economies of the EU as the countries of Germany, France, and the United Kingdom represent a very formidable competitor to U.S. businesses and service industries which are attempting to compete in the new world economy.

Similarly, East Asian countries have begun the process of integrating their economies through such regional free-trade groups as the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC], which recently agreed to establish free trade in the region by 2020 for all of its 18 members, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN], which currently has seven members but is seeking to incorporate other countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Burma. ASEAN has rapidly become the world's largest regional trade area (with over 400 million people) and its members recently announced they would lower their tariffs from 0-5 percent shortly after the year 2000.

If the United States fails to continue to insist on its inclusion in these regional groups, supporters of the East Asia Economic Caucus (ASEAN plus China, Japan, and South Korea), which has been proposed by the outspoken Malaysian Prime Minister Mr. Mahathir, may be successful in excluding the United States from Asia and the Pacific region—the fastest growing market in the world.

Not to be left out of trade liberalization, South and Central America and the Caribbean have recently fragmented into several regional free-trade groups including:

Andean Pact: Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela.

Mercosur or Southern Common Market: Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay.

Central American Common Market: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica.

Caricom: Antigua, Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent, the Grenadines, Trinidad, Tobago.

Clearly, the United States will suffer economically, politically, and strategically if it chooses to isolate itself from global and regional trade liberalization efforts. History is replete with examples of countries, like China, who turned inward instead of facing the difficult but necessary challenges of adapting to new circumstances, and therefore greatly suffered.

With only 250 million people, the United States cannot afford to refuse to trade with emerging markets in the world's developing countries. Through the year 2025, developing countries are expected to account for 95 percent of the world's population growth. More staggering is the fact that only 10 markets—those of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Poland, Turkey, China, South Korea, Indonesia, India, and South Africa will produce one-half of the world's goods and services by the year 2010, but will account for \$1 trillion in incremental U.S. exports during that same period.

Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly believes Americans can compete to sell their innovative products and services anywhere in the world provided they are given a fair and equal opportunity without excessive Government interference. Consequently, I vigorously oppose unilaterally surrendering these future markets to our industrialized competitors in the Asia and Pacific region and in Western Europe by isolating ourselves from regional and global economic liberalization. Accordingly, this Member urges his colleagues to support free-trade agreements, such as an enlarged NAFTA, which help ensure that American exporters will be able to compete on a level playing field.

□ 1915

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous

order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KIM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SANDERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Committee on the Judiciary of this 104th Congress reported out, after extended hearings and even more extended markup, immigration reform legislation which for the very first time in modern times will in fact actually substantively and positively reform both the system of illegal immigration and our efforts by this Government to combat this tremendous drain on our national resources as well as legal immigration.

I am happy to have been a part of that process, but what makes me even happier is an event that happened in my own district in Smyrna, GA, this past Monday evening. This past Monday evening, State Representative Randy Sauder pulled together for the very first time in the district—and probably for the first time in the State of Georgia—a comprehensive task force to study the effects of illegal immigration and to develop solutions to the problem of illegal immigration in our district.

Representative Sauder pulled together as members of this task force, in addition to myself and representatives from other congressional and Senatorial offices, a vast array of local and State law enforcement officials, other State representatives, municipal authorities, police chiefs, other law enforcement officials, the regional director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, representatives of the Department of Labor, other agents and, perhaps most importantly of all, a number of private citizens who were involved with illegal immigration—combating illegal immigration—that is, in their communities and in their businesses.

And through the work of this task force, which began last Monday evening, on the eve of our historic action in the Committee on the Judiciary, passing this important legislation to be considered hopefully very soon by this very body, was a process of really coming to grips with and letting those of us in the Congress responsible for drafting the laws with regard to both legal and illegal immigration, a comprehensive look at how illegal immigration has affected and continues to adversely affect our communities in terms of the number of illegal aliens involved in criminal activity, in terms of the financial burdens placed on our communities, not just in the Seventh District of Georgia but indeed in many respects all across this country, the drain on the medical services, the drain on our welfare system and, indeed, other problems that are too lengthy to go into here this evening.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Representative Sauder for his foresightedness in recognizing this problem, in recognizing that its

solution goes far beyond the bounds of any one jurisdiction. It affects our homes, our schools, our businesses, our hospitals, our religious institutions, our local government, our State government and, indeed, all taxpayers of this country.

Through the work of Representative Sauder's task force, we hope over the next several months, Mr. Speaker, to really delve into the problem of illegal immigration and how it affects our communities. This work will be especially important to me as a Representative from the Seventh District to assist me in crafting the very best legislation possible, to identify those areas where additional work needs to be done, to helping direct precious taxpayer resources to combat the problem of illegal immigration in America. And I salute Representative Sauder for his work and look forward to working closely with him as an important part of the overall legislative effort of this Congress and future Congresses to come to grips with the crippling problem of illegal immigration in our country.

#### NURSING HOME STANDARDS PRESS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it defies common sense that Republicans are stripping away basic protections for elderly residents of nursing homes, under the guise of cutting the bureaucracy. The fact of the matter is that quality standards for nursing homes are not bureaucratic and onerous, they are necessary. These regulations don't tie the hands of nursing homes, they keep nursing homes from tying the hands of seniors.

Now, I cannot believe that my Republican colleagues are deliberately trying to put nursing home residents at risk, so I must conclude that they simply don't understand how these regulations protect nursing home residents from neglect and abuse. So, let me explain, briefly, how they work in my home State of Connecticut.

As one Connecticut official comments in this article: "Without these standards and people to watch them, these situations will continue. That man might still be counting the dots on the ceiling."

The Republican Medicaid plan will mean the end of uniform safety standards for nursing home residents. It will create a patchwork of standards across the country. Some States may do a great job, others may not. For nursing home patients it will be a crap shoot. The quality of your care will depend on where you live. That's wrong. Our seniors deserve better.

Now, my Republican colleagues want the American people to believe that this budget package is about shared sacrifices for a noble purpose. But,

there is nothing shared in this sacrifice and there is nothing noble in its purpose.

This is a story from Monday's Connecticut Post which explains how these Federal protections worked for two people. It reads:

Paralyzed in a car accident, a 38-year-old man lay flat on his back for four days in a Connecticut nursing home, able only to count the dots on ceiling tiles \* \* \*

In another Connecticut nursing home, an elderly man who suffered a sudden onset of dementia was overdressed by staff to the point where he was unrecognizable and couldn't function \* \* \*

In both cases, it took intervention by state ombudsmen wielding copies of federal nursing home standards to correct the problems and protect the residents.

And, there is nothing revolutionary about returning America's seniors to the health care dark ages of bed restraints and mind-altering drugs.

#### CASTRO'S TRAVELING ROAD SHOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation was witness to a great traveling road show which arrived from Havana. Its main star was the Cuban tyrant Fidel Castro, in his never ending campaign to reform his image from a ruthless dictator, which he is, to a harmless politician, which he is not.

Even though Castro's acting is cruelly trite and cynically predictable, it hypnotized much of American media, business leaders and, I am disappointed to say, some Members of our body. It was quite revolting to see how this dictator, who leads a regime that our State Department characterized as "sharply restricting basic political and civil rights, including the rights of citizens to change their government, the freedoms of speech, press, association, assembly and movement, as well as the right to privacy and various workers rights," well, he was warmly greeted in the Bronx by three of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle who hail from New York City, including the dean of the city's delegation.

This group of Congressman ignored the well-known repression of the Castro regime, repression which is condemned by human rights groups like Amnesty International, which said about Castro's regime that "members of unofficial political human rights and trade union groups continue to face imprisonment, short-term detention and frequent harassment."

□ 1930

Instead, the congressional groupies accepted Castro with open arms. My Democrat colleague from the Bronx hosted a rally for the dictator on Monday evening telling the Cuban tyrant that he would always be welcomed in that city. My favorite however, was an-

other Member of this body from that city's delegation who, even though she was forced to wait in line to attend the rally, stated that she did not mind waiting in line to see Fidel Castro.

You would think that such enthusiasm is reserved only for movie stars, but not in this instance. It is a shame that Members of this body carry such low respect for our democratic system that they would salivate over the leader who has gone to great extremes to destroy democracies around the world, and who still speaks negatively of political pluralism.

Sadly, another one of my colleagues has accepted Castro's invitation to travel to Cuba, along with a delegation of representatives of American corporations. How can our Federal official authorize such a business trip? Let us hop that they do not.

Mr. Speaker, similarly outrageous was the reception that the United Nations gave Castro. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali warmly embraced Castro as he entered the organization. This shameful portrayal made by the United Nations leader is symptomatic of the hypocrisy embodied in that body, as it speaks of freedom and human rights, but then goes ahead and turns its back on the millions of Cubans who suffer under Fidel Castro.

This same organization now wants to implement global taxes to fund its inefficient bureaucracy. Reports have emerged recently that the United Nations wants to implement taxes on international currency and stock transactions, as a means to gain greater revenue for its activities. This initiative would gravely affect American citizens and businesses who already are the biggest contributors to the United Nations. This is a dangerous phenomenon which grossly expands the scope and mission of the organization and one which the Congress should raise its voice against.

The great missing link in Castro's visit were questions about his regime. None of the American media, congressional Members or business leaders bothered to ask Castro about the repressive nature of his regime. Nobody asked him about the political prisoners. No one asked him about the fate of Rev. Orson Vila Santoyo, who continues imprisoned for practicing his religious faith. No one asked him of the fate of Nilvio Labrada, who was put in a mental institution for demonstration against Fidel Castro. No one asked Castro when he would leave power, conduct elections, allow freedom of expression, allow opposition on the island. Nobody. Instead, those who fraternized with Castro had a mission. Business leaders want to make a quick buck off the Cuban workers sweat in Castro's plantation economy. The media continued its romanticized description of Castro, ignoring his human rights offenses, and my liberal congressional colleagues were just willing political pawns in Castro's propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, Castro came and went but his repression against the Cuban people remains today. This should always be the bottom line when dealing with Castro, and it is unfortunate that many sold their soul to the devil for, in the end, their mission will be unsuccessful. The Cuban people will be free someday, and they will remember, together with history, who stood for freedom and who preferred to prostitute themselves to the whims of the tyrant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROEMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2020, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LIGHTFOOT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-291)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2020) "making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 10, 30, 32, 33, 39, 41, 42, 44, 50, 51, 64, 73, 83, 85, 87, 89, 90, 91, 98, 99, 110, 111, 118, 124, 134, 137, 138, and 141.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 25, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 45, 49, 53, 54, 55, 61, 63, 66, 71, 72, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 92, 94, 95, 96, 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, and 123, and agree to the same.

Amendment No. 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted in said amendment insert: *\$105,929,000, of which up to \$500,000 shall be available to reimburse the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department for personnel costs incurred by the Metropolitan Police Department between May 19, 1995 and September 30, 1995 as a result of the closing to vehicular traffic of Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest and other streets in the vicinity of the White House: Provided, That Section 640 of Title VI of the Treasury Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103-329, 108 Stat. 2432), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "This section shall not apply to any claim where the employee has received any compensation for overtime hours worked during the period covered by the claim under any other provision of law, including, but not limited to, 5 U.S.C. 5545(c), or to any claim for compensation for time spent commuting between the employee's residence and duty station."*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert:

*TREASURY BUILDINGS AND ANNEX REPAIR AND RESTORATION*

*For the repair, alteration, and improvement of the Treasury Building and annex, and the Secret Service Headquarters Building, \$21,491,000, to remain available until expended.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: *\$10,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken in said amendment amended to read as follows: *travel expenses of non-Federal law enforcement personnel to attend meetings concerned with financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation*;

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *\$22,198,000; Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network may procure up to \$500,000 in specialized, unique or novel automatic data processing equipment, ancillary equipment, software, services, and related resources from commercial vendors without regard to otherwise applicable procurement laws and regulations and without full and open competition, utilizing procedures best suited under the circumstances of the procurement to efficiently fulfill the agency's requirements: Provided further, That funds appropriated in this account may be used to procure personal services contracts*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *\$184,300,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken in said amendment, amended to read as follows: *: Provided further, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 178.118 or to change the definition of "Curios or relics" in 27 CFR 178.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, *: Provided further, That the Commissioner of the Customs Service designate a single individual to be port director of all United States Government activities at two ports of entry, one on the southern border and one on the northern border: Provided further, That \$750,000 shall be available for additional part-time and temporary positions in the Honolulu Customs District*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert: *\$64,843,000 which*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: *\$1,723,764,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken in said amendment, amended to read as follows: *: Provided, That \$13,000,000 shall be used to initiate a program to utilize private counsel law firms and debt collection agencies in the collection activities of the Internal Revenue Service in compliance with section 104 of this Act and, on page 13, line 3, of the House of Representatives engrossed bill, H.R. 2020, after "which" insert "up to" and, on line 4, after "Program," delete "no amount of which shall be available for IRS administrative costs,"*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *\$1,527,154,000, of which no less than \$695,000,000 shall be available for tax systems modernization activities*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted in said amendment, insert: *: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for tax systems modernization, \$100,000,000 may not be obligated*

*until the Secretary of the Treasury provides a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate that (1) with explicit decision criteria, identifies, evaluates, and prioritizes all systems investments planned for fiscal year 1996, (2) provides a schedule for successfully mitigating deficiencies identified by the General Accounting Office in its April 1995 report to the Committees, (3) presents a milestone schedule for development and implementation program, and (4) presents a plan to expand the utilization of external expertise for systems development and total program integration*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *\$531,944,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted in said amendment, insert:

*(a) As authorized by section 190001(e), \$69,314,000 of which \$25,690,000 shall be available to the United States Customs Service for expenses associated with "Operation Hardline"; of which \$21,010,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms of which no less than \$14,410,000 shall be available to annualize the salaries and related costs for the fiscal year 1995 supplemental initiative, and of which no less than \$3,500,000 shall be available for administering the Gang Resistance Education and Training program, and of which \$3,100,000 shall be available for ballistics technologies; of which \$21,600,000 shall be available to the United States Secret Service, of which no less than \$1,600,000 shall be available for enhancing forensics technology to aid missing and exploited children investigations; and of which \$1,014,000 shall be available to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center; and ; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment No. 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: *107*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted in said amendment, insert:

*COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS*

*SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

*For necessary expenses of the Council in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1021), \$3,180,000.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

*OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY*

*SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

*(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)*

*For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; for research activities pursuant to title I of Public Law 100-690; not to exceed \$8,000 for official reception and representation expenses; for participation in*



joint projects or in the provision of services on matters of mutual interest with nonprofit, research, or public organizations or agencies, with or without reimbursement; \$23,500,000, of which \$16,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available to the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center for counternarcotics research and development projects and shall be available for transfer to other Federal departments or agencies; and of the funds made available to the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center, \$600,000 shall be transferred to the Drug Enforcement Administration for the El Paso Intelligence Center: *Provided, That the Office is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Office.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

*FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS  
HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS  
PROGRAM*

*(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)*

For necessary expenses of the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, \$103,000,000 for drug control activities consistent with the approved strategy for each of the designated High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas, of which no less than \$55,000,000 shall be transferred to State and local entities for drug control activities; and of which up to \$48,000,000 may be transferred to Federal agencies and departments at a rate to be determined by the Director: *Provided, That the funds made available under this head shall be obligated within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

*ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
RELATIONS*

*SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, \$784,000, of which \$334,000 is to carry out the provisions of Public Law 104-4, and of which \$450,000 shall be available only for the purposes of the prompt and orderly termination of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 48:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

*ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED  
STATES*

*SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Conference of the United States, established under subchapter V of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, \$600,000: *Provided, That these funds shall only be available for the purposes of the prompt and orderly termination of the Administrative Conference of the United States by February 1, 1996.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 52:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$20,542,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$5,066,149,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 57:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$545,002,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

*New Construction:*

*Colorado:*

Lakewood, Denver Federal Center, U.S. Geological Survey Lab Building, \$25,802,000

*Florida:*

Tallahassee, U.S. Courthouse Annex, \$24,015,000

*Georgia:*

Savannah, U.S. Courthouse Annex, \$2,597,000

*Louisiana:*

Lafayette, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, \$29,565,000

*Maryland:*

Prince Georges County, Food and Drug Administration, \$55,000,000

*Nebraska:*

Omaha, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, \$53,424,000

*New Mexico:*

Albuquerque, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, \$6,126,000

*New York:*

Central Islip, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, \$189,102,000

*North Dakota:*

Pembina, Border Station, \$11,113,000

*Pennsylvania:*

Scranton, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse Annex, \$24,095,000

*South Carolina:*

Columbia, U.S. Courthouse Annex, \$3,562,000

*Texas:*

Austin, Veterans Affairs Annex, \$7,940,000

Brownsville, Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, \$27,452,000

*Washington:*

Point Roberts, U.S. Border Station, \$3,516,000

Seattle, U.S. Courthouse, \$5,600,000

*West Virginia:*

Martinsburg, Internal Revenue Service Computer Center, \$63,408,000

*Non-prospectus Projects Program, \$12,685,000;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: : *Provided further, That the \$6,000,000 under the heading of nonprospectus construction projects, made available in Public Laws 102-393 and 103-123 for the acquisition, lease, construction and equipping of flexplace work telecommuting centers, is hereby increased by \$5,000,000 from funds made available in this Act for non-prospectus construction projects, all of which shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That of the \$5,000,000 made available by this*

*Act, half shall be used for telecommuting centers in the State of Virginia and half shall be used for telecommuting centers in the State of Maryland: Provided further, That of the funds made available for the District of Columbia, Southeast Federal Center, under the heading, "Real Property Activities, Federal Buildings Fund, Limitations on Availability of Revenue" in Public Law 101-509, \$55,000,000 are rescinded: Provided further, That the limitation on the availability of revenue contained in such Act is reduced by \$55,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment No. 60

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$637,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 62

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

*Repairs and Alterations:*

*Arkansas:*

Little Rock, Federal Building, \$7,551,000

*California:*

Sacramento, Federal Building (2800 Cottage Way), \$13,636,000

*District of Columbia:*

ICC/Connecting Wing Complex/Customs (phase 2/3), \$58,275,000

*Illinois:*

Chicago, Federal Center, \$45,971,000

*Maryland:*

Woodlawn, SSA East High-Low Buildings, \$17,422,000

*North Dakota:*

Bismarck, Federal Building, Post Office and U.S. Courthouse, \$7,119,000

*Pennsylvania:*

Philadelphia, Byrne-Green Complex, \$30,909,000

Philadelphia, SSA Building, Mid-Atlantic Program Service Center, \$11,376,000

*Puerto Rico:*

Old San Juan, Post Office and U.S. Courthouse, \$25,701,000

*Texas:*

Dallas, Federal Building (Griffin St.), \$5,641,000

*Washington:*

Richland, Federal Building, U.S. Post Office, and Courthouse, \$10,000,000

*Nationwide:*

Chlorofluorocarbons Program, \$43,533,000

Elevator Program, \$13,109,000

Energy Program, \$20,000,000

Advance Design, \$22,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 65

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the proposed by said amendment, insert: \$2,326,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows: : *Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized to enter into and perform such leases, contracts, or other transactions with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, the several States, or the District of Columbia, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation, as may be necessary to implement the trade center plan at the Federal Triangle Project; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment No. 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$5,066,149,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 69:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted in said amendment, insert:

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

*For expenses authorized by law, not otherwise provided for, necessary for asset management activities; utilization of excess and disposal of surplus personal property; transportation management activities; procurement and supply management activities; Government-wide and internal responsibilities relating to automated data management, telecommunications, information resources management, and related activities; utilization survey, deed compliance inspection, appraisal, environmental and cultural analysis, and land use planning functions pertaining to excess and surplus real property; agency-wide policy direction; Board of Contract Appeals; accounting, records management, and other support services incident to adjudication of Indian Tribal Claims by the United States Court of Federal Claims; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$119,091,000.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 70:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$33,274,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 74:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the section number named, insert: 5; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 76:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert:

*SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and thereafter, no funds may be obligated or expended in any way for the purpose of the sale, excessing, surplus, or disposal of lands in the vicinity of Norfolk Lake, Arkansas, administered by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, without the specific approval of the Congress.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert:

*SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and thereafter, no funds may be obligated or expended in any way for the purpose of the sale, excessing, surplus, or disposal of lands in the vicinity of Bull Shoals Lake, Arkansas, administered by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, without the specific approval of the Congress.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 78:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first section number in said amendment, insert: 9; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 84:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

*In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: \$88,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be made available for the establishment of health promotion and disease prevention programs for Federal employees; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment No. 88:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken in said amendment, amended to read as follows:

*Section 1. Section 1104 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) in paragraph (2)—*

*(i) by inserting after "title" the following: "the cost of which examinations shall be reimbursed by payments from the agencies employing such judges to the revolving fund established under section 1304(e)"; and*

*(ii) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and*

*(B) by striking the matter following paragraph (2) through "principles."; and*

*(2) in subsection (b) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*"(4) At the request of the head of an agency to whom a function has been delegated under subsection (a) (2), the Office may provide assistance to the agency in performing such function. Such assistance shall, to the extent determined appropriate by the Director of the Office, be performed on a reimbursable basis through the revolving fund established under section 1304(e)."*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 93:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$33,269,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 97:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

*SEC. 512. Notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and thereafter, no funds may be obligated or expended in any way to withdraw the designation of the Virginia Inland Port at Front Royal, Virginia, as a United States Customs Service port of entry.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 101:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: *in fiscal year 1996 for those operations and programs previously provided for by appropriation*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 104:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted in said amendment, insert: *(retention of receipts is for the circulating operations and programs): Provided further, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment No. 107:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *Provided further, That provisions of law governing procurement or public contracts shall not be applicable to the procurement of goods or services necessary for carrying out Mint programs and operations; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment No. 109:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

*SEC. 524. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefit program which provides an benefits or coverage for abortions, after the last day of the contract currently in force for any such negotiated plan.*

*SEC. 525. The provision of section 524 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or that the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 122:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

*SEC. 627. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for any employee training when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such employee training—*

*(1) does not meet identified needs for knowledge, skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties;*

*(2) contains elements likely to induce high levels of emotional response or psychological stress in some participants;*

*(3) does not require prior employee notification of the content and methods to be used in the training and written end of course evaluation;*

*(4) contains any methods or content associated with religious or quasi-religious belief systems or "new age" belief systems as defined in Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Notice N-195.022, dated September 2, 1988;*

*(5) is offensive to, or designed to change, participants' personal values or lifestyle outside the workplace; or*

*(6) includes content related to human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS) other than that necessary to make employees more aware of the medical ramifications of HIV/AIDS and the workplace rights of HIV-positive employees.*

*(b) Nothing in this section shall prohibit, restrict, or otherwise preclude an agency from conducting training bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 125:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first section number in said amendment, insert: 628; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment No. 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 629. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act may be expended by any Federal Agency to procure any product or service that is subject to the provisions of Public Law 89-306 and that will be available under the procurement by the Administrator of General Services known as "FTS2000" unless—

(1) such product or service is procured by the Administrator of General Services as part of the procurement known as "FTS2000"; or

(2) that agency establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator of General Services that—

(A) that agency's requirements for such procurement are unique and cannot be satisfied by property and service procured by the Administrator of General Services as part of the procurement known as "FTS2000"; and

(B) the agency procurement pursuant to such delegation, would be cost-effective and would not adversely affect the cost-effectiveness of the FTS2000 procurement.

(b) After July 31, 1996, subsection (a) shall apply that if the Administrator of General Services has reported that the FTS2000 procurement is producing prices that allow the Government to satisfy its requirements for such procurement in the most cost-effective manner.

(c) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct and deliver a comprehensive analysis of the cost of the Federal government of all Federal agency telecommunications services and traffic, by agency, and provide such report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by no later than May 31, 1996: Provided, That such report shall (1) identify which agencies are using FTS2000 systems; (2) determine whether or not such usage is cost-effective; and (3) provide a comparison of telecommunication costs between agencies that use or do not use FTS2000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment No. 127:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 630; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment No. 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

Sec. 631. (a) Section 5402 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (f) by striking out "During the period beginning January 1, 1985, and ending January 1, 1999, the " and inserting in lieu thereof "The"; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

"(D) have provided schedule service within the State of Alaska for at least 12 consecutive months with aircraft—

"(i) up to 7,500 pounds payload capacity before being selected as a carrier of nonpriority bypass mail at an applicable intra-Alaska bush service mail rate; and

"(ii) over 7,500 pounds payload capacity before being selected as a carrier of nonpriority bypass mail at the intra-Alaska mainline service mail rate."

(b)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective on and after August 1, 1995.

(2) Subparagraph (D) of section 5402(g)(1) title 39, United States Code (as in effect before the amendment made under subsection (a)) shall apply to a carrier, if such carrier—

(A) has an application pending before the Department of Transportation for approval under section 41102 or 41110(e) of title 39, United States Code, before August 1, 1995; and

(B) would meet the requirements of such subparagraph if such application were approved and such certificate were purchased.

(c) Section 41901(g) of title 49, United States Code, is repealed.

And the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment No. 129:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

## SEC. 632. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE PROVISION OF CERTAIN FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of the Treasury shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to make any loan or extension of credit under section 5302 of title 31, United States Code, with respect to a single foreign entity or government of a foreign country (including agencies or other entities of that government)—

(1) with respect to a loan or extension of credit for more than 60 days, unless the President certifies to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives that—

(A) there is no projected cost (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) to the United States from the proposed loan or extension of credit; and

(B) any proposed obligation or expenditure of United States funds to or on behalf of the foreign government is adequately backed by an assured source of repayment to ensure that all United States funds will be repaid; and

(2) other than as provided by an Act of Congress, if that loan or extension of credit would result in expenditures and obligations, including contingent obligations, aggregating more than \$1,000,000,000 with respect to that foreign country for more than 180 days during the 120-month period beginning on the date on which the first such action is taken.

(b) WAIVER OF LIMITATIONS.—The President may exceed the dollar and time limitations in subsection (a)(2) if he certifies in writing to the Congress that a financial crisis in that foreign country poses a threat to vital United States economic interests or the stability of the international financial system.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR A RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—A presidential certification pursuant to subsection (b) shall not take effect, if the Congress, within thirty calendar days after receiving such certification, enacts a joint resolution of disapproval, as described in paragraph (5) of this subsection.

(1) REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES.—All joint resolutions introduced in the Senate to disapprove the certification shall be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and in the House of Representatives, to the appropriate committees.

(2) DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES.—(A) If the committee of either House to which a resolution has been referred has not reported it at the end of 15 days after its introduction, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the joint resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution introduced with respect to the same matter, except no motion to discharge shall be in order after the committee has reported a joint resolution with respect to the same matter.

(B) A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, and is privileged in the Senate; and debate thereon shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, the time to be divided in the Senate equally between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—(A) A motion in the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a resolution shall be privileged.

(B) Debate in the Senate on a resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 4 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(C) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a resolution shall be limited to not more than 20 minutes, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the resolution, except that in the event the manager of the resolution is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto, shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(D) A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a resolution, debatable motion, or appeal is not debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, a resolution is in order in the Senate.

(4) In the case of a resolution, if prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House, that House receives a resolution with respect to the same matter from the other House, then—

(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution of the 2 Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress disapproves the action of the President under section 632(b) of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996, notice of which was submitted to the Congress on . . .", with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—This section—

(1) shall not apply to any action taken as part of the program of assistance to Mexico announced by the President on January 31, 1995; and

(2) shall remain in effect through fiscal year 1996.

And the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment No. 130:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 633. For purposes of each provision of law amended by section 704(a)(2) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5318 note), no adjustment under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, shall be considered to have taken effect in fiscal year 1996 in the rates of basic pay for the statutory pay systems.

And the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment No. 131:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 634; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 133:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

**SEC. 636.** This section may be cited as the "Prohibition of Cigarette Sales to Minors in Federal Buildings and Lands Act".

(a) As used in this section—

(1) the term "Federal agency" means—

(A) an Executive agency as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) each entity specified in subparagraphs (B) through (H) of section 5721(1) of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term "Federal building" means—

(A) any building or other structure owned in whole or in part by the United States or any Federal agency, including any such structure occupied by a Federal agency under a lease agreement; and

(B) includes the real property on which such building is located;

(3) the term "minor" means an individual under the age of 18 years; and

(4) the term "tobacco product" means cigarettes, cigars, little cigars, pipe tobacco, smokeless tobacco, snuff, and chewing tobacco.

(b)(1) No later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services and the head of each Federal agency shall promulgate regulations that prohibit—

(A) the sale of tobacco products in vending machines located in or around any Federal building under the jurisdiction of the Administrator or such agency head; and

(B) the distribution of free samples of tobacco products in or around any Federal building under the jurisdiction of the Administrator or such agency head.

(2) The Administrator of General Services or the head of an agency, as appropriate, may designate areas not subject to the provisions of paragraph (1), if such area also prohibits the presence of minors.

(3) The provisions of this subsection shall be carried out—

(A) by the Administrator of General Services for any Federal building which is maintained, leased, or has title of ownership vested in the General Services Administration; or

(B) by the head of a Federal agency for any Federal building which is maintained, leased, or has title of ownership vested in such agency.

(c) No later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services and each head of an agency shall prepare and submit, to the appropriate committees of Congress, a report that shall contain—

(1) verification that the Administrator or such head of an agency is in compliance with this section; and

(2) a detailed list of the location of all tobacco product vending machines located in Federal buildings under the administration of the Administrator or such head of an agency.

(d)(1) No later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House of Representatives Committee on House Administration, after consultation with the Architect of the Capitol, shall promulgate regulations under the Senate and House of Representatives rule-making authority that prohibit the sale of tobacco products in vending machines in the Capitol Buildings.

(2) Such committees may designate areas where such prohibition shall not apply, if such area also prohibits the presence of minors.

(3) For the purpose of this section the term "Capitol Buildings" shall have the same meaning as such term is defined under section 16(a)(1) of the Act entitled "An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other pur-

poses", approved July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193m(1)).

(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed as restricting the authority of the Administrator of General Services or the head of an agency to limit tobacco product use in or around any Federal building, except as provided under subsection (b)(1).

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 135:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

**SEC. 637. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON RESTRUCTURING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) While the budget for the Internal Revenue Service (hereafter referred to as the "IRS") has risen from \$2.5 billion in fiscal year 1979 to \$7.3 billion in fiscal year 1996, tax returns processing has not become significantly faster, tax collection rates have not significantly increased, and the accuracy and timeliness of taxpayer assistance has not significantly improved.

(2) To date, the Tax Systems Modernization (TSM) program has cost the taxpayers \$2.5 billion, with an estimated cost of \$8 billion. Despite this investment, modernization efforts were recently described by the GAO as "chaotic" and "ad hoc".

(3) While the IRS maintains that TSM will increase efficiency and thus revenues, Congress has had to appropriate additional funds in recent years for compliance initiatives in order to increase tax revenues.

(4) Because TSM has not been implemented, the IRS continues to rely on paper returns, processing a total of 14 billion pieces of paper every tax season. This results in an extremely inefficient system.

(5) This lack of efficiency reduces the level of customer service and impedes the ability of the IRS to collect revenue.

(6) The present status of the IRS shows the need for the establishment of a Commission which will examine the organization of IRS and recommend actions to expedite the implementation of TSM and improve service to taxpayers.

(b) COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—To carry out the purposes of this section, there is established a National Commission on Restructuring the Internal Revenue Service (in this section referred to as the "Commission").

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of thirteen members, as follows:

(A) Five members appointed by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government, two from private life, and one from an organization that represents a substantial number of Internal Revenue Service employees.

(B) Two members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, one from Members of the Senate and one from private life.

(C) Two members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate, one from Members of the Senate and one from private life.

(D) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one from Members of the House of Representatives and one from private life.

(E) Two members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, one from Members of the House of Representatives and one from private life.

The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service shall be an ex officio member of the Commission.

(3) CHAIRMAN.—The Commission shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

(4) MEETING; QUORUM; VACANCIES.—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairman or a majority of its

members. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) APPOINTMENT; INITIAL MEETING.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—It is the sense of the Congress that members of the Commission should be appointed not more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section.

(B) INITIAL MEETING.—If, after 60 days from the date of the enactment of this section, seven or more members of the Commission have been appointed, members who have been appointed may meet and select a Chairman who thereafter shall have the authority to begin the operations of the Commission, including the hiring of staff.

(c) FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The functions of the Commission shall be—

(A) to conduct, for a period of not to exceed one year from the date of its first meeting, the review described in paragraph (2), and

(B) to submit to the Congress a final report of the results of the review, including recommendations for restructuring the IRS.

(2) REVIEW.—The Commission shall review—

(A) the present practices of the IRS, especially with respect to—

(i) its organizational structure;

(ii) its paper processing and return processing activities;

(iii) its infrastructure; and

(iv) the collection process;

(B) requirements for improvement in the following areas:

(i) making returns processing "paperless";

(ii) modernizing IRS operations;

(iii) improving the collections process without major personnel increases or increased funding;

(iv) improving taxpayer accounts management;

(v) improving the accuracy of information requested by taxpayers in order to file their returns; and

(vi) changing the culture of the IRS to make the organization more efficient, productive, and customer-oriented;

(C) whether the IRS could be replaced with a quasi-governmental agency with tangible incentives and internally managing its programs and activities and for modernizing its activities, and

(D) whether the IRS could perform other collection, information, and financial service functions of the Federal Government.

(d) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section—

(i) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths, and

(ii) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member may deem advisable.

(B) Subpoenas issued under subparagraph (A)(ii) may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, the chairman of any designated subcommittee, or any designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman, subcommittee chairman, or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(2) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this section.

(3) **INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this section. Each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman.

(4) **ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—(A) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized on a nonreimbursable basis to provide the Commission with administrative services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(B) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a nonreimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(C) In addition to the assistance set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B), departments and agencies of the United States are authorized to provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as they may deem advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(5) **POSTAL SERVICES.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) **STAFF OF THE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairman, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable to a person occupying a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(2) **CONSULTANT SERVICES.**—The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) **COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—

(1) **COMPENSATION.**—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each member of the Commission may be compensated at not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(B) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States or Members of Congress shall receive no additional pay on account of their service on the Commission.

(2) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(g) **FINAL REPORT OF COMMISSION; TERMINATION.**—

(1) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress its final report, as described in subsection (c)(2).

(2) **TERMINATION.**—(A) The Commission, and all the authorities of this section, shall terminate on the date which is 60 days after the date on which a final report is required to be transmitted under paragraph (1).

(B) The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in subparagraph (A) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its final report and disseminating that report.

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated for the activities of the Commission.

(i) **APPROPRIATIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, \$1,000,000 shall be available from fiscal year 1996 funds appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service, "Information systems" account, for the activities of the Commission, to remain available until expended.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 136:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

**SEC. 638.** The Administrator of General Services shall, within six months of enactment of this Act, report to Congress on the feasibility of leasing agreements with State and local governments and private sponsors for the construction of border stations on the borders of the United States with Canada and Mexico whereby—

(1) lease payments shall not exceed 30 years for payment of the purchase price and interest;

(2) an agreement entered into under such provisions shall provide for the title to the property and facilities to vest in the United States on or before the expiration of the contract term, on fulfillment of the terms and conditions of the agreements.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 139:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert: 639; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 140:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

**SEC. 640.** Service performed during the period January 1, 1984, through December 31, 1986, which would, if performed after that period, be considered service as a law enforcement officer, as defined in section 8401(17) (A)(i)(II) and (B) of title 5, United States Code, shall be deemed service as a law enforcement officer for the purposes of chapter 84 of such title.

and, on page 78, line 23 of the House of Representatives engrossed bill, H.R. 2020, after "code", insert the following: "or Sec. 613 of this Act".

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference reports in disagreement amendment numbered 132.

JIM LIGHTFOOT,  
FRANK R. WOLF,  
ERNEST ISTOOK,  
JACK KINGSTON,  
MIKE FORBES,  
BOB LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD C. SHELBY,  
JAMES M. JEFFORDS,  
BEN NIGHTHORSE  
CAMPBELL,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
BOB KERREY,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996, incorporates some of the language and allocations set forth in House Report 104-183 and Senate Report 104-121. The language in these reports should be complied with unless specifically addressed in the accompanying statement of the managers.

#### REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS

The conferees agree with the Senate language stating requirements for agency requests for reprogramming and transfer actions.

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

##### DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1. Inserts Senate language permitting \$2,950,000 for information technology modernization to remain available until expended and deletes House language limiting the availability.

Amendment No. 2. Appropriates \$105,929,000 instead of \$104,000,500 as proposed by the House, and \$110,929,000 as proposed by the Senate. Also includes up to \$500,000 in reimbursements to the District of Columbia for personnel costs incurred as a result of the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue, and amends Section 640 of P.L. 103-329.

##### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

The House reduced funding for the Office of the Under Secretary of Law Enforcement by \$1,066,000; the Senate did not address this issue. The conferees agree that \$66,000 shall be reduced from the fiscal year 1996 request for the Office of the Under Secretary of Treasury for Law Enforcement. The conferees direct that no funds be reprogrammed into this Office without prior Congressional approval.

Of the amounts provided to the Office of the Under Secretary, the conferees direct that up to \$500,000 shall be transferred to the District of Columbia for its costs associated with the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue. This transfer is consistent with a provision recommended by the Senate which requires the Department of Treasury to reimburse the District of Columbia for these costs.

The conferees have also become aware of disparate personnel laws and regulations among the various Federal law enforcement agencies, as well as concerns that certain Treasury law enforcement bureaus have had difficulty disciplining employees because of overly restrictive personnel regulations. The conferees therefore direct the Office of the

Secretary to report back to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on options for changing the statutory and regulatory structure for Treasury law enforcement agencies to make recruiting, hiring, firing, promotions, demotions and lateral moves easier. The report should include options such as moving all Treasury law enforcement personnel to the excepted service and creating a broad-band pay structure for such employees. The report shall be due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than March 1, 1996.

The conferees remain concerned with regard to the difficulties on the part of Treasury law enforcement bureaus in obtaining authorization from the Department of State in securing foreign posting for law enforcement officers. The conferees therefore request a report from the Department of Treasury to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that identifies where Treasury bureaus need to post agents by country, the types of cases that those agents would be assigned, the rationale for such assignments and the cost of such postings. The report should include options on reducing the cost of overseas postings to Treasury bureaus. The report shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than March 1, 1996.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT/  
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The conferees withdraw the requirement included in the House report that the Mint and the BEP report directly to the Assistant Secretary of Treasury for Management/Chief Financial Officer. The conferees do agree with the House that the Treasurer shall provide only oversight and guidance for the Mint and BEP and should not monitor day-to-day operations.

UNDER SECRETARY FOR DOMESTIC FINANCE

The conferees note that a major Treasury Department issue which involves the Bureau of Engraving and Printing (BEP) is the ongoing currency redesign initiative which is rightfully being tasked out from the Office of the Under Secretary of Treasury for Domestic Finance. Major Treasury Department issues which involve the United States Mint are ongoing discussions over the introduction of the one dollar coin as well as electronic forms of cash such as stored-value cards. These efforts are also rightfully tasked out from the Office of the Under Secretary of Treasury for Domestic Finance. However, both the BEP and the Mint are organizationally found under the Assistant Secretary for Management, not the Under Secretary for Domestic Finance. It appears that this is not the proper organizational location for these agencies which have much more in common with the Financial Management Service and the Bureau of Public Debt, both of which report to the Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, than with Treasury organizations which report to the Assistant Secretary for Management.

In the interests of securing the most appropriate mechanism for these two organizations to receive proper policy oversight, the conferees recommend that the Secretary of Treasury review his organizational structure to ensure that the BEP and the U.S. Mint are reporting to the most appropriate Treasury official. The Secretary should report to the Committees only if he determines that there should be no change in the current organizational structure.

U.S. DUTCH TREATY PROTOCOL AMENDMENTS OF  
1993

The conferees strongly agree with the House report language regarding the U.S. Dutch Treaty Protocol Amendments of 1993. While the Department has until October 31,

1995 to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Committees have not received any indication that the Department is moving to permanently correct this problem. The conferees instruct the Department of Treasury to implement a permanent solution as stated in the House report.

PROPERTY ACCOUNTABILITY IMPROVEMENTS

The conferees are encouraged by the widespread interest in moving property/asset accountability activities from a periodic physical audit and inventory process to an automated information based process. The interest in automated information management procedures, as expressed by various Department officials, and put forth in the National Performance Review, shows a significant potential for meaningful cost savings.

It is the belief of the conferees that the Department's property management function lends itself to, and could benefit from, commercial off-the-shelf information technology including software, computer-based laminate barcode printers, barcode readers and storage devices.

TREASURY BUILDINGS AND ANNEX REPAIR AND  
RESTORATION

Amendment No. 3. Appropriates \$21,491,000 instead of no appropriation as proposed by the House and \$7,684,000 as proposed by the Senate. Included in this amount is \$7,684,000 for repairs and alteration requirements of the Treasury Building and Annex and \$13,807,000 for the Secret Service's new headquarters building.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 4. Appropriates \$29,319,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$30,067,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TREASURY FORFEITURE FUND

Amendment No. 5. Appropriates \$10,000,000 instead of eliminating this account as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Because of the importance of standardizing law enforcement communications and moving to narrow band communications equipment, the conferees agree that the Department may apply up to \$3,500,000 of the \$10,000,000 appropriated in the Treasury Forfeiture Fund to the Enforcement Federal Wireless Communications project. The conferees furthermore agree that resources within this account may be transferred to ATF for costs related to development of its canine explosives detection program.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 6. Restores and modifies House language authorizing FinCEN to offset the cost of travel for law enforcement personnel only.

Amendment No. 7. Appropriates \$22,198,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,273,000 as proposed by the House. Also includes House proposed language allowing FinCEN to procure up to \$500,000 for specialized automated data processing equipment without complying with procurement regulations and authorizing the use of its funds to procure personal services contracts.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING  
CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 8. Deletes House provision permitting the Director of FLETC to offset part of the cost of travel expenses for certain individuals training at FLETC.

Amendment No. 9. Deletes House provision authorizing FLETC to obligate funds for site security and expansion of antiterrorism training facilities.

Amendment No. 10. Appropriates \$36,070,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$34,006,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING  
CENTER

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS,  
AND RELATED EXPENSES

Amendment No. 11. Appropriates \$9,663,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,163,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that the "related expenses" of this account may be used to pay for the cost of direct hire and contractor personnel entirely engaged in the execution of expansion and repair projects.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 12. Appropriates \$184,300,000 instead of \$181,837,000 as proposed by the House and \$186,070,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13. Inserts Senate language permitting \$14,277,000 to remain available until expended for systems modernization requirements.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS  
(ATF)

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 14. Appropriates \$377,971,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$391,035,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees have reduced the request by \$7,874,000 for program enhancements and \$5,000,000 for base equipment needs because the Congress funded these activities in the Fiscal Year 1995 Supplemental Appropriations Act. The conferees have increased the request by \$1,150,000 and five FTE's to reflect a transfer-back of the funding and positions which the Administration proposed to be funded in the "Foreign Law Enforcement" account. The conferees have denied the \$4,700,000 in ATF's base for the violence reduction alliance initiative. The conferees have reduced the account by \$2,800,000 for ATF's support role in the GREAT Program. This funding has been shifted to the Violent Crime Trust Fund along with continued funding for GREAT grants to existing communities. Finally, the conferees have reduced administrative overhead object classes by \$3,690,000 to be applied at the discretion of the Director. The reductions shall be applied to object classes 21.0, 22.0, 23.3, 24.0, 25.0, 26.0, and 31.0. The reduction in the equipment activity should be restored to ATF's base in fiscal year 1997. Funding for counterterrorism initiatives has been included in the "Violent Crime Trust Fund" account.

Amendment No. 15. Restores and modifies House language prohibiting ATF from obligating funds for administrative expenses or compensation or for any employee to amend the definition of "curios or relics" as published in the Code of Federal Regulations or remove items from ATF publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994.

EXPLOSIVES DETECTION PROGRAM

The conferees understand that ATF has developed a method of training canines to detect explosive and fire accelerants that is more accurate and reliable than techniques employed elsewhere. This success has resulted in urgent requests by foreign governments such as Israel, Egypt and Greece for technical assistance in establishing their own programs in the ATF style. The conferees are concerned, however, that, although other nations have benefited from this technique, it has not been widely disseminated in the United States.

The conferees therefore direct ATF to develop a formal program to train explosives and accelerant detection canines and handlers from local, state and Federal agencies.



Treasury Asset Forfeiture funds may be used for positions and capital improvements at the training facility currently being used in Front Royal, Virginia.

The conferees encourage all Federal agencies with a need for explosives and accelerant detection capabilities to consider using ATF's canine explosives and accelerant detection program.

#### EXPLOSIVES DESENSITIZATION

The conferees are aware of an Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) recommendation that Naval Surface Weapons Center Indian Head play a major role in any Ammonium Nitrate desensitization initiatives. The OTA report states that Indian Head has the highest concentration of explosives experts in the world, and that Indian Head is running the only insensitive munitions program in the U.S., with extensive experience in Ammonium Nitrate mixtures. In addition, the ATF has worked with the International Fertilizer Development Center. The conferees recommend that ATF continue to strongly involve Indian Head and the Center in any desensitization program.

#### FIRE RESEARCH

The conferees would also like to recognize the accomplishments in fire research conducted by the University of Maryland. The conferees are aware that ATF and the University of Maryland have in the past shared expertise and knowledge. Considering the important work yet to be done in the area of fire science and arson investigation, the conferees encourage the continuation and expansion of this partnership.

#### UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 16. Appropriates \$1,387,153,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,392,429,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees deny the President's request to transfer \$8,280,000 to foreign law enforcement and assumes savings of \$2,677,000 from administrative overhead.

#### WESTERN HEMISPHERIC TRADE

The conferees have included funding for review of trade issues to be equally divided between the Center for Study of Western Hemispheric Trade in Texas and the Northern Plains and Rockies Center for the Study of Western Hemispheric Trade in Montana at no more than half the level provided in 1995.

Amendment No. 17. Restores House language and inserts Senate language requiring the Commissioner to designate a single individual to be port director of all government activities at two ports of entry and earmarks \$750,000 for additional part-time and temporary positions in the Honolulu Customs District.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 18. Appropriates \$64,843,000 instead of \$60,993,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,543,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19. Deletes House language allowing \$5,644,000 to remain available until expended.

#### BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING

##### CURRENCY REDESIGN EFFORT

The conferees do not agree with the House language directing that the U.S. Treasurer have full operational control over all aspects of the public relations effort for currency redesign. The conferees agree that the currency redesign effort should remain under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the Under Secretary of Treasury for Domestic Finance.

The conferees further agree that transferring or detailing full time equivalents and/or

funding from any Treasury bureau or department to the Office of the Treasurer represents an augmentation of appropriations for Departmental Offices and should not be pursued without prior Congressional approval.

#### DISTINCTIVE PAPER FOR CURRENCY

The conferees agree that the House and Senate report language concerning the procurement of distinctive paper for the printing of currency is complimentary and is therefore supported by the conferees. Additionally, the conferees agree that none of the report language shall contradict the law which states that all requirements for the domestic manufacture of paper shall not apply if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that no domestic manufacturer of distinctive paper for currency or securities exists.

#### U.S. MINT PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND

Both the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations included language establishing the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund. The Senate language included minor changes to the House proposed language to which the conferees agree. The conferees agree with language included in the House report requiring the Director of the U.S. Mint and the Secretary of Treasury to file certain financial statements and reports.

The conferees further agree that the Director shall ensure that the revenues and expenses from the circulating coinage and numismatic operations are recorded separately. Additionally, receipts from coinage operations shall not be used to fund numismatic operations, nor shall receipts from numismatic operations be used to fund circulating coinage operations.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

##### PROCESSING, ASSISTANCE, AND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 20. Appropriates \$1,723,764,000 instead of \$1,682,742,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,767,309,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### IRS REGULATIONS AFFECTING INTERCITY BUS FUEL EXCISE TAX REFUNDS

The conferees are concerned that many intercity bus companies are not receiving Federal diesel fuel excise tax refunds that are due to them. The IRS regulation regards the dyeing of diesel fuel to prevent illegal use of tax-free diesel fuel. Intercity buses are allowed to use either tax-free and remit the appropriate excise tax or use fully taxed fuel and seek an appropriate refund.

While the conferees understand the rationale for this regulation, they are concerned that it may be impeding services provided by intercity bus companies to rural areas, the elderly, the young and the poor. The conferees expect the IRS to work with the appropriate Congressional committees to resolve this serious problem expeditiously.

#### ELECTRONIC FILING

The conferees fully support the goals accompanying Tax Systems Modernization (TSM) as outlined by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). However, the conferees seek a better understanding of actions taken by the IRS during the most recent tax season that have caused a dramatic decline in electronic filing, the cornerstone of TSM. The conferees request the IRS to include in the TSM business plan, the specific steps the IRS, in cooperation with the electronic filing industry, intends to take to maintain and increase the current levels of electronic filing.

The conferees believe that the IRS has made significant strides in deterring and detecting fraud, but make the observation that many hardworking, honest taxpayers have been inconvenienced due to last filing season's changes. Further, the conferees believe

that the IRS should work constructively with all participants (Congress, electronic filing industry, and taxpayers) who have a stake in electronic filing to ensure that the problems experienced during the most recent tax season will not be repeated.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

##### TAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

Amendment No. 21. Appropriates \$4,097,294,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,254,476,000 as proposed by the House.

#### TAX COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE

In fiscal year 1995, Congress provided a total of \$4,385,459,000 for Tax Law Enforcement which was comprised of a base program of \$3,980,459,000 and \$405,000,000 for the first installment of a new five year, \$2,000,000,000 tax compliance initiative. In fiscal year 1996, the Administration requested a total of \$4,524,351,000 for Tax Law Enforcement which is comprised of a base program of \$4,119,351,000 and the second installment of \$405,000,000 for the tax compliance initiative. The conferees have appropriated \$4,097,294,000 for the base program, a three percent increase over the 1995 level and .5 percent less than the request, but due to funding constraints could not provide the second installment of \$405,000,000 for the tax compliance initiative. However, the conferees agree that within the funds available IRS should aggressively pursue tax compliance.

The conferees do not believe that this action sends a signal that voluntary compliance is no longer a priority or that the action rewards tax cheats. The conferees are dedicated to ensuring the effective and efficient collection of taxes and strongly agree that IRS should pursue those who willfully and purposefully provide erroneous information to the IRS. The fact that overall IRS funding provided by the conference agreement represents 65 percent of the total discretionary allocation available to the conferees is a testament to this dedication.

Amendment No. 22. Restores and modifies House language authorizing \$13,000,000 for a private debt collection initiative.

#### INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

##### INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Amendment No. 23. Appropriates \$1,527,154,000 instead of \$1,571,616,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,442,605,000 as proposed by the Senate and places a "floor" of \$695,000,000 on the expenditures for Tax Systems Modernization (TSM), which is \$26,000,000 less than the House minimum for TSM and \$25,000,000 more than the Senate minimum for TSM.

Amendment No. 24. Deletes House language and modifies Senate language on Tax Systems Modernization.

#### TAX SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION

The conferees have also included legislative language which "fences" \$100,000,000 of the funds appropriated for tax systems modernization until the Secretary of the Treasury reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate. The report shall use explicit decision criteria to identify, evaluate, and prioritize all systems investments planned for fiscal year 1996; include a schedule for successfully mitigating deficiencies identified by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in its April 1995 report to the Committees; establish a schedule for development and implementation of all projects included in the tax systems modernization program; and, provide a plan to expand the utilization of external, not Internal Revenue Service (IRS), expertise for systems development and integration.

The conferees direct GAO to review the IRS report, when completed, to ensure that,



in fact, deficiencies identified by GAO have been corrected. GAO shall provide an independent assessment of the actions taken by IRS to address these deficiencies in a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by no later than April 1, 1996. Should the IRS report not be available prior to that time, the conferees direct the GAO to provide status reports to the Committees on IRS corrective actions and provide such assessment within 30 days of receipt of the IRS report.

The IRS has been told by a number of sources, including the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the GAO, and the National Academy of Sciences that, within the IRS, there is not the level of expertise required for proper development and implementation of TSM. The House and the Senate Appropriations Committees have urged IRS to move toward greater use of the contractor community and its expertise in the area of systems development and total program integration. Thus far, IRS has been reluctant to pursue this approach, relying instead on internal organizational structures. The conferees have therefore included language which requires the IRS to develop a plan to expand the utilization of contractor expertise for systems development and total program integration. As stated by the Senate, the IRS is a revenue collection agency, not an automation design company and should use contractor resources more effectively.

Furthermore, the conferees believe that the Secretary of the Treasury should continue to exercise direct oversight control of the management of TSM, providing guidance and assistance when necessary.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Amendment No. 25. Deletes House language prohibiting the transfer of funds from the tax law enforcement account in fiscal year 1996.

#### UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 26. Appropriates \$531,944,000 instead of \$542,461,000 as proposed by the House and \$534,502,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees deny funding of \$2,300,000 for mainframe computer replacement and financial systems enhancements, deny the transfer of \$3,100,000 to Foreign Law Enforcement, and assume administrative overhead savings of \$7,646,000, as proposed by the Senate. The conferees include \$16,295,000 to restore base funding requirements which have eroded over the past several years. The conferees fund \$13,807,000 associated with the new headquarters building in a separate account and \$3,278,000 in protection costs associated with the upcoming Summer Olympics in the Violent Crime Trust Fund account.

#### VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 27. Appropriates \$69,314,000 instead of \$51,686,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. This includes \$21,010,000 for the ATF, of which \$3,100,000 shall be available for the further development of ballistics imaging technologies as part of the "CEASEFIRE" program, \$3,500,000 shall be available for administering the GREAT program, and the remaining \$14,410,000 shall be available to continue funding for recent expansions in the arson and explosives detection and investigation program. The conferees also provide \$25,690,000 for the U.S. Customs Service's "Operation Hardline" to bolster drug law enforcement efforts at the U.S.-Mexico border, \$21,600,000 for the United States Secret Service, and \$1,014,000 for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

Of the \$21,600,000 provided to the Secret Service, the conferees include \$5,000,000 for

anti-counterfeiting efforts, \$1,600,000 for missing and exploited children, \$400,000 for the Treasury Recipient Income Verification Program and \$3,278,000 for the upcoming Summer Olympics and the remaining funds for other Secret Service activities.

Amendment No. 28. Appropriates \$7,200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,200,000 as proposed by the House.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Amendment No. 29. Deletes House language authorizing Treasury to transfer up to 2 percent between appropriations accounts with the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Amendment No. 30. Deletes Senate language exempting Customs personnel funded through reimbursement from the Puerto Rico Trust Fund from government-wide work force reductions.

Amendment No. 31. Inserts Senate language authorizing the Treasury Department to use its aircraft to assist Federal agencies in carrying out emergency law enforcement support to protect human life, property, public health or safety.

Amendment No. 32. Deletes Senate language authorizing the expenditure of up to \$500,000 to reimburse the District of Columbia for personnel costs incurred as a result of the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue.

#### TITLE II—U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

##### FEDERAL POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The conferees strongly believe that the Federal postal employees who volunteered to fight the recent fires on Long Island, NY, from August 21 to September 6, 1995 should be paid their equivalent salaries for the time that they devoted to fighting fires. The Postal Service has previously indicated the employees must take vacation time or unpaid leave, but the conferees believe that the Presidential declaration of a national disaster in this case warrants, and the Postmaster General concurs, that all postal workers who were engaged as volunteer firefighters in the Long Island fires will be "held harmless," not lose vacation or personal time, and be paid the equivalent of their salaries for their time donated to the disaster.

#### TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

##### THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 33. Appropriates \$39,459,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$38,131,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

##### OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 34. Appropriates \$7,827,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,522,000 as proposed by the House.

##### EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

##### WHITE HOUSE REPAIR AND RESTORATION

Amendment No. 35. Inserts Senate language establishing an appropriation of \$2,200,000 to fund repairs and restoration activities at the White House.

##### SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 36. Appropriates \$3,280,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,175,000 as proposed by the House.

##### COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 37. Appropriates \$3,180,000 instead of eliminating this account as proposed by the House and \$3,439,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY FORMULATION

The conferees have restored funding for the Council of Economic Advisers in the amount

of \$3,180,000 but remain concerned over the duplication of effort within the Executive Office of the President as it relates to advising the President on economic policy. The conferees are also concerned that the specific functions and responsibilities of the Council are not ones which necessarily require a full time Federal employment level of 35 and annual operating costs of \$3.5 million. The conferees direct CEA to submit, as part of its fiscal year 1997 budget request, a report on the current organizational structure of economic advice to the President including an assessment of the roles of the Office of Management and Budget and the National Economic Council as they relate to the formulation, coordination, and implementation of national economic policy. This report should also include a specific plan for streamlining economic advice to the President and structuring a full time volunteer Council of Economic Advisers using, for instance, academicians, fellows, and other individuals to provide independent economic advice to the President.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 38. Appropriates \$6,648,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,459,000 as proposed by the House.

##### OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 39. Appropriates \$25,736,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$25,560,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 40. Appropriates \$55,573,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$55,426,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41. Deletes a provision inserted by the Senate prohibiting the obligation of fiscal year 1996 funds by OMB until a report on longer-term budgeting has been submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The conferees did not include the Senate provision since the information required from OMB on this subject was provided to the Committees prior to conference action.

#### LONG-TERM BUDGETING

The first and most significant recommendation endorsed by a majority of the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform was that the Federal government make major spending and tax decisions with reference to a longer time period than the traditional five year budget window. As a result, the Senate Committee on Appropriations requested OMB to provide a 30-year analysis of the costs of the major entitlement programs. That information was submitted to the Committee in a letter dated, September 12, 1995. The conferees have decided to print that letter and the accompanying document in the statement of managers so that the American public can be aware of the long-range costs facing the country as a result of entitlement programs. That information follows:

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

*Washington, DC, September 12, 1995.*

Hon. J. ROBERT KERREY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KERREY: In response to your interest in the long-range outlook for the Federal budget, enclosed is a table that lists long-range baseline projections. These projections extend the baseline estimates published in the Administration's Mid-Session Review of the 1996 Budget for a period of thirty years.

These projections use the best methodology and data available. However, it is very important to recognize the large uncertainties inherent in making projections of receipts and outlays this far into the future. The projections are obviously highly sensitive to the underlying economic and demographic assumptions. In addition, they rely on a simplified model of the budget. Receipts projections are based on a simplified derivation of tax bases implied by the underlying economic assumptions. Discretionary budget

authority and outlays follow the caps specified in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 through FY 1998 and rise at the rate of inflation thereafter. Outlays for major entitlement programs are projected using a combination of underlying economic assumptions, available actuarial data and an analysis of recent trends.

It is also important to recognize that all of the projections in the enclosure are baseline estimates. They do not reflect the policies in the President's balanced budget plan or in

the Congressional Budget Resolution. Instead, they only project the effects of current laws assuming the policies underlying those laws are not changed.

I hope this information is helpful to you and I look forward to working with you to address both the short- and long-term fiscal problems our nation faces.

Sincerely,

Alice M. Rivlin,  
Director.

#### LONG-RANGE BASELINE PROJECTIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Baseline totals:										
Receipts .....	1,418	1,485	1,561	1,644	1,737	1,831	1,928	2,028	2,133	2,251
Outlays .....	1,603	1,682	1,756	1,846	1,946	2,037	2,143	2,250	2,368	2,499
Deficit (—) .....	—185	—197	—194	—202	—208	—206	—216	—222	—235	—248
Memorandum:										
Discretionary budget authority .....	522	535	542	558	576	594	612	631	650	671
Trust fund surplus/deficit (—): <sup>1</sup>										
OASDI <sup>2</sup> .....	75	81	87	92	98	105	112	120	127	135
HI/SMI .....	6	—4	—9	—16	—23	—31	—40	—49	—59	—70
Civil service retirement .....	27	27	28	29	32	33	34	35	36	36
Military retirement .....	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	—1	—2	—2

<sup>1</sup> Based on most recent actuarial reports.

<sup>2</sup> Figures are for calendar years.

#### LONG-RANGE BASELINE PROJECTIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Baseline totals:										
Receipts .....	2,363	2,485	2,611	2,742	2,878	3,020	3,167	3,320	3,477	3,639
Outlays .....	2,627	2,763	2,908	3,066	3,235	3,413	3,602	3,806	4,026	4,264
Deficit (—) .....	—264	—278	—298	—324	—357	—393	—435	—487	—549	—625
Memorandum:										
Discretionary budget authority .....	691	713	735	758	781	805	830	856	883	910
Trust fund surplus/deficit (—): <sup>1</sup>										
OASDI <sup>2</sup> .....	144	152	157	159	162	164	161	154	143	128
HI/SMI .....	—83	—97	—111	—128	—148	—170	—196	—227	—261	—299
Civil service retirement .....	37	37	38	38	39	39	40	40	40	41
Military .....	—3	—4	—5	—6	—7	—8	—8	—9	—9	—5

<sup>1</sup> Based on most recent actuarial reports.

<sup>2</sup> Figures are for calendar years.

#### LONG-RANGE BASELINE PROJECTIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Baseline totals:										
Receipts .....	3,807	3,985	4,167	4,355	4,552	4,755	4,967	5,188	5,413	5,650
Outlays .....	4,511	4,772	5,053	5,353	5,675	6,017	6,383	6,775	7,194	7,644
Deficit (—) .....	—704	—787	—886	—998	—1,123	—1,261	—1,416	—1,587	—1,782	—1,995
Memorandum:										
Discretionary budget authority .....	938	967	997	1,028	1,060	1,093	1,127	1,162	1,198	1,235
Trust fund surplus/deficit (—): <sup>1</sup>										
OASDI <sup>2</sup> .....	108	81	49	12	—30	—78	—132	—193	—260	—334
HI/SMI .....	—341	—389	—444	—505	—571	—644	—727	—821	—924	—1,037
Civil service retirement .....	42	43	44	45	46	47	49	50	52	54
Military retirement .....	8	11	41	46	52	59	66	74	82	92

<sup>1</sup> Based on most recent actuarial reports.

<sup>2</sup> Figures are for calendar years.

#### PRIVATIZATION OF NONPERFORMING FEDERAL LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEES

The conferees are aware that some Federal agencies are exploring the privatization of Federal loan and loan guarantees. For example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) recently held an auction of 177 multifamily loans that had defaulted on mortgage insurance written by HUD. The unpaid amount of these defaulted loans was more than \$900,000,000, but because of the Government's poor collection history, the loans were valued by OMB as worth only \$286,000,000 if they continued to be held by the Government. However, these same loans were sold to private investors for \$710,000,000. This one transaction alone reduced the deficit by \$424,000,000.

The private sector was, in this case, willing to pay more than twice the value of these loans to the Government because there is a huge productivity gap between the Government and private sector (technology, infrastructure and expertise in managing bad

loans, and profit motive). In short, the private sector has the technology, capacity, ability and motivation to produce more value than the Government ever could.

The conferees believe that more consideration should be given to the sale of loans and loan guarantees held not only by HUD, but by all Federal agencies that provide credit programs. The Federal Government holds huge amount of loans and loan guarantees that are worth more in the hands of the private sector. The estimated amounts are \$800,000,000 of loan guarantees and \$200,000,000 in loans.

Using conservative estimates, it may be that between \$20,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000 could be realized if much of the Federal credit program was to be turned over to the private sector. However, it is impossible to ascertain the value of such an effort because many of the agencies are unaware of the value imbedded in their credit programs and how such transfers might be achieved.

Therefore, the conferees direct the Office of Management and Budget to direct, and coordinate with, the Federal agencies involved in credit programs to evaluate the value of their credit programs, including the cost of annual administrative expenses and develop a plan for the privatization of such credit programs. The Director of OMB shall be responsible for assuring the implementation of this directive and coordinating the activities of all Federal agencies hereunder.

Specifically, OMB is directed to have the various agencies provide the following information: for each financing account and for each liquidating account, as those terms are defined in sections 502(7) and 502(8) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990; the cumulative balance of direct loans outstanding, the estimated net present value of such direct loans, the annual administrative expenses (the portion of salaries and expenses that are directly related to such loans outstanding), and the estimated net proceeds that would be received if such direct loans

were sold; the cumulative balance of guaranteed loans outstanding, the estimated net present value of such loan guarantees, the annual administrative expenses (the portion of salaries and expenses that are directly related to such guaranteed loans outstanding), and the estimated net proceeds that would be received if such loan guarantees were sold; and the cumulative balance of defaulted loans that were previously guaranteed and have resulted in loans receivable, the estimated net present value of such loan assets, the annual administrative expenses (the portion of salaries and expenses that are directly related to such loan assets), and the estimated net proceeds that would be received if such direct loans were sold.

On or before March 31, 1996, OMB shall require each Federal agency that makes or has made direct loans or loan guarantees, as those terms are defined in sections 502(1) and 502(2) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, to prepare and issue a report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the House and Senate and a detailed plan containing the agency's proposed schedule, by fiscal year, and providing for the transfer to the private sector the sale, by September 30, 2002, of all direct loans, loan guarantees and defaulted loans that were previously guaranteed and have resulted in loans receivable to the extent such transfer would result in a net profit to the Treasury. Such schedule shall be updated annually on the first day of each successive fiscal year, and shall include a detailed plan for the sale of all direct loans, loan guarantees and defaulted loans that were previously guaranteed that are added to the agency's financing accounts subsequent to October 1, 1995.

#### STREAMLINING THE EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE PROCESS

The conferees note that there are a number of Federal agencies involved in settling employee grievances: the Federal Labor Relations Authority, the Merit Systems Protection Board, the Office of Special Counsel, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Office of Personnel Management. The conferees believe that there are opportunities to streamline this somewhat unwieldy structure and therefore direct the Administration to develop a legislative proposal to restructure all Federal employee adjudicatory functions and submit this plan to Congress no later than February 1, 1996.

#### INFORMATION SECURITY OVERSIGHT OFFICE

Amendment No. 42. Deletes Senate language appropriating \$1,482,000 for salaries and expenses under the Executive Office of the President.

The original President's 1996 budget request included \$1,482,000 for a new Independent Agency titled "Information Security Oversight Office". A subsequent budget amendment eliminated the request for an Independent Agency and moved the information security oversight office (ISOO), and \$1,482,000, to the National Archives and Records Administration. The House eliminated funding, within the National Archives, for the ISOO and the Senate funded it as a separate agency under the Executive Office of the President at a level of \$1,482,000.

The conferees agree that as a separate agency, ISOO shall cease to exist and have eliminated the funding recommended by the Senate. The conferees have provided funding for ISOO in the National Archives and Records Administration appropriation.

#### OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 43. Restores and modifies funding and language inserted by the House and stricken by the Senate. The conferees have provided \$23,500,000 for Office of National Drug Control Policy activities in fiscal year 1996. Included in this amount is \$7,500,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office and \$16,000,000 for the research and development projects of the Counter-Drug Technology Assessment Center (CTAC). Of the amounts appropriated to CTAC, \$600,000 is for automated data processing improvements at the Drug Enforcement Administration's El Paso Intelligence Center.

#### CALIFORNIA GUNLINK PROJECT

The conferees direct the Office of National Drug Control Policy to use a portion of the \$3,100,000 made available under the fiscal year 1995 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act to purchase no more than six ballistics imaging machines for the California Gunlink project and use remaining resources to develop networking capabilities among the different models of ballistics imaging systems.

#### MODEL STATE DRUG LAWS

The conferees direct the Office of National Drug Control Policy to apply \$1,000,000 for the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws for conferences to be held by Governors to review model state drug laws as proposed by the President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws.

#### DRUG AND ALCOHOL ADDICTION PROJECT

The conferees urge the Chief Scientist to consider a collaborative effort, designed by the Medical College of Pennsylvania and Hahnemann University, to implement a demonstration project to explore the causes and treatments of drug and alcohol addiction, in collaboration with Albert Einstein Medical Center of Philadelphia.

Amendment No. 44. Deletes language and funding inserted by the Senate for the Office of National Drug Control Policy. While the conferees have agreed to delete the bill language proposed by the Senate, the conferees remain concerned about the trends of drug abuse in this country and the effectiveness of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to deal with this continuing problem. Despite an investment of over \$86 billion in Federal anti-drug programs since Fiscal Year 1988, the number of hardcore drug users has remained constant at 2.7 million. More disturbing are recent surveys which indicate that since 1992 there has been an increase in the use of illicit drugs amongst our nation's youth and a disturbing change in attitudes toward the acceptability of drug use.

Despite significant increases in Federal spending there has been a lack of a clear and loud voice from the Administration in speaking out on drug abuse. If the Federal Government is going to continue to provide billions of dollars to combat illicit drug trafficking and abuse then it must ensure that the problem receives the highest level of attention at the Cabinet level, and private sector representatives participate in policy development and direction. Therefore, the conferees strongly urge the President to convene a Cabinet Council, involving all Cabinet members whose departments play a role in drug control policy, to meet on a regular basis to discuss and formulate strategies to effectively reduce drug abuse in this country. In addition, the conferees strongly urge the President to convene a bipartisan conference on drug control, inviting representatives from prevention, law enforcement, education, treatment, business leadership, media and parent organizations to participate in the formulation of a strategy to re-

duce drug abuse. The conferees expect the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to report to the Committees on Appropriations by no later than January 15, 1996, on the progress being made in this regard.

#### FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS HIGH INTENSITY DRUG TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM

Amendment No. 45. Deletes Housing language appropriating \$104,000,000 for the HIDTA program.

Amendment No. 46. Appropriates \$103,000,000 for the HIDTA program instead of \$104,000,000, as proposed in Amendment No. 45 and \$110,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, including \$55,000,000 for state and local governments and \$48,000,000 for Federal agencies. The conferees direct that these reductions in the Federal share be taken proportionately from all the existing HDTAs.

#### TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

##### ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (ACIR) SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 47. Appropriates \$784,000 instead of \$334,000 as proposed by the Senate and no appropriation as proposed by the House and includes language directing the orderly termination of ACIR.

The conferees have appropriated a total of \$784,000 for ACIR: \$334,000 to conduct a study on unfunded mandates and \$450,000 for costs associated with the termination of the agency.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES (ACUS) SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 48. Appropriates \$600,000 instead of no appropriation as proposed by the House and \$1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### TERMINATIONS COSTS

The conferees have agreed to provide a total of \$600,000 for the orderly termination of operations at ACUS which shall begin on October 1, 1995, and be completed no later than February 1, 1996. The conferees agree that this agency shall cease to exist and the appropriation of \$600,000 shall be used only to close down operations at ACUS.

##### COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 49. Appropriates \$1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,682,000 as proposed by the House.

##### FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION (FEC) SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 50. Appropriates \$26,521,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$28,517,000 as proposed by the Senate and earmarks \$1,500,000 for internal automated data processing systems.

Amendment No. 51. Restores House language prohibiting the use of funds by FEC until a report is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on a systems requirements analysis on the development of an ADP system.

##### FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 52. Appropriates \$20,542,000 instead of \$19,742,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,398,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

##### LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

Amendment No. 53. Inserts Senate language inserting an account heading.

Amendment No. 54. Inserts Senate language allowing an appropriation into the Federal Buildings fund (FBF).

Amendment No. 55. Inserts Senate language appropriating \$86,000,000.

Amendment No. 56. Limits obligation from the FBF to \$5,066,149,000 instead of \$5,066,822,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,086,019,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57. Makes available \$545,002,000 for new construction of Federal buildings instead of \$367,777,000 as proposed by the House and \$573,872,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58. Inserts and modifies Senate language which provides funding for the construction of certain Federal buildings and facilities.

#### YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO U.S. COURTHOUSE

The fiscal year 1996 request includes \$17,436,000 for the U.S. Courthouse in Youngstown, Ohio. The conferees have not provided funds for the construction of this project in fiscal year 1996 because the General Services Administration (GSA) has advised the conferees that the contract for this project cannot be awarded in fiscal year 1996. Because of the urgent need of the courts in Youngstown, the conferees instruct GSA to continue preliminary design work on this project in fiscal year 1996 and request funds in fiscal year 1997 for the construction of this new courthouse project. The conferees further note that they will do their best to fund this project as one of the highest priorities in fiscal year 1997.

#### SEATTLE, WASHINGTON COURTHOUSE

The conference agreement provides \$5,600,000 to continue design work on the new courthouse in Seattle, Washington. Should this amount be insufficient to fully fund the design efforts for this facility, the conferees encourage the GSA to reprogram funds from other available resources.

#### BROOKLYN, NEW YORK COURTHOUSE

The conferees are aware of the "space emergency" facing the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York. GSA has proposed two projects to accommodate the space requirements of the Brooklyn Courthouse acquisition and renovation of the adjacent General Post Office Building and demolition of the Federal building portion of the Celler complex, followed by construction of a new court annex on that site. Earlier Congresses have appropriated funds for the initial phases of his project. The House bill contained \$49,400,000 to partially fund the renovation of the General Post Office Building. The Senate bill contained no funding because GSA had notified the Committee that it would not be able to expend any additional funds in fiscal year 1996. The conferees support continuation of this project and urge GSA to submit a prospectus in fiscal year 1997 to move to the next phase.

#### RAPTOR RESEARCH CENTER

The conferees support the GSA's efforts to consolidate the Raptor Research Center at Boise State University in a building donated to the University. It is the understanding of the conferees that GSA's renovation costs of the donated building will be far less than leasing new space.

#### TELECOMMUTING CENTERS

Of the funds made available by this Act for telecommuting centers in northern Virginia, the conferees urge GSA to establish at least one center at a suitable location in western Fairfax County, one in Loudoun County, and one in eastern Prince William County, Virginia.

#### CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE, PARKING

The conferees agree that given the lack of available parking at the newly constructed Warren B. Rudman Federal Courthouse in

Concord, N.H., and an employees' reliance upon auto transportation, a parking space availability problem will undoubtedly arise. Accordingly, the conferees believe that should the City of Concord build a parking facility to accommodate the vehicles of 400 people, (including 300 federal employees, as well as various citizens and court officials), the federal government should use this new parking facility for its employees' benefit to the maximum extent possible.

#### LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, COURTHOUSE

The conferees are aware of the need for a new courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada. Land for the site for this project will be donated to the Federal government by the City of Las Vegas at no cost. The conferees have not provided funds for the construction of this project in fiscal year 1996 because the General Services Administration has advised the conferees that the contract for this project cannot be awarded until June 1997. Because of the urgent need of the courts in Nevada, the conferees instruct GSA to continue preliminary design work on this project in fiscal year 1996 and request funds in fiscal year 1997 for the construction of this new courthouse project. The conferees further note that they will do their best to fund this project as one of the highest priorities in fiscal year 1997.

#### FDA CONSOLIDATION

The conferees request GSA study the White Oak, Maryland site for the consolidation of FDA facilities.

Amendment No. 59. Restores House language on Flexiplace Telecommuting Centers and inserts Senate language which rescinds \$55,000,000 from the Southeast Federal Center in Washington, D.C.

Amendment No. 60. Makes available \$637,000,000 for repairs and alterations instead of \$713,086,000 as proposed by the House and \$627,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61. Inserts Senate language authorizing unobligated balances in the repairs and alterations account to be used for implementing security improvements at Federal buildings, upon compliance with reprogramming guidelines of the Committees on Appropriations.

Amendment No. 62. Inserts and modifies Senate language providing funding for repairs and alterations of certain Federal buildings and facilities.

Amendment No. 63. Makes available \$304,757,000 for basic repairs and alterations as proposed by the Senate instead of \$307,278,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 64. Restores House language earmarking \$100,000 for the advanced design for the renovation of the national veterinary science laboratory and a biocontainment facility.

Amendment No. 65. Makes available \$2,326,200,000 for rental of space instead of \$2,341,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,327,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66. Makes available \$1,302,551,000 for building operations as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,389,463,000 as proposed by the House. Also inserts Senate language earmarking \$1,000,000 for support for the Xth Paralympiad.

Amendment No. 67. Restores and modifies House language moving the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation to the General Services Administration (GSA).

Amendment No. 68. Limits obligations from the Federal Buildings Fund to \$5,066,149,000 instead of \$5,066,822,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,086,019,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69. Inserts and modifies language proposed by the Senate which provides funds for GSA policy and operations and appropriates \$119,091,000 instead of \$113,827,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$111,629,000 as proposed by the House.

#### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION OPERATING EXPENSES

The Administration requested that the traditional single account for the Policy and Operations of the General Services Administration (GSA) be separated into two appropriations. The House agreed with this approach and funded the Policy Oversight appropriation at \$62,499,000 and the Operating Expenses appropriation at \$49,130,000. The Senate retained that traditional approach and funded both of these organizations in one appropriation of \$113,827,000.

The conferees agree with the Senate position to provide funding for Policy and Operations within the Operating Expenses appropriation and have funded this appropriation at \$119,091,000. However, the conferees direct GSA to ensure separate and distinct offices for Policy/Oversight and Operations. The Policy and Oversight office should be responsible for developing and overseeing government-wide policy while the Operations office should carry out GSA's other mission of providing services.

The conference agreement should not prejudice any decision by the Office of Management and Budget to once again submit a budget request for GSA which provides separate appropriations for Policy and Operations. The conferees agree with the House position that the goal of developing government-wide policy direction could be at odds with GSA's other goal of increasing its operational base and the OMB should consider future budgets which would provide a more definitive separation of these two goals.

Within the \$119,091,000 appropriated for GSA, funds shall be available for the ongoing ICN project, as directed by the House.

The conferees have also included funds for the CLASS project in Lincoln, Nebraska, a telecommunications demonstration project for an on-line accredited education program leading to a high school diploma or its equivalent.

#### REVIEW OF FEDERAL SUPPLY SCHEDULES

The Senate included language which directed the General Services Administration (GSA) to postpone rules to implement section 1555 of the Federal Acquisition and Streamlining Act (FASA) until a comprehensive analysis of the effect of such rules has been completed. The House did not address this issue.

The conferees agree that considerable concern has been raised by some private sector vendors on the effect of the implementation of section 1555 of FASA, and believe that additional study should be undertaken before implementation of some of the more controversial schedules. Therefore, the conferees direct that the GSA enforce a one-year moratorium on the implementation of section 1555 of FASA for certain more controversial schedules until final action on this matter is taken by the appropriate Congressional committees.

#### CHILD CARE CENTERS

On June 28, 1995, the U.S. Department of Justice submitted to Congress its report, "Vulnerability Assessment of Federal Facilities". This document establishes minimum security standards for Federal buildings. Within these standards, the conferees believe the General Services Administration (GSA) should review the placement of child care centers in Federal buildings. The conferees direct the Administrator of GSA to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations an evaluation of future plans to ensure the safety of child care centers within the standards, as established.

#### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 70. Appropriates \$33,274,000 instead of \$32,549,000 as proposed by the

House and \$34,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees request that the Office of the Inspector General (IG) audit the policies and procedures for using the Flexiplace Telecommuting Centers to determine adequacy of the methods currently being used by agencies to account for employee time and attendance. Additionally, the IG should review the process used by GSA to determine the costs and benefits of additional telecommuting centers and submit a report on this review to the Committees on Appropriations no later than February 1, 1996.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 71. Inserts Senate language adding Judicial Conference as a participant in determining Courthouse construction priorities.

Amendment No. 72. Inserts Senate language adding Judicial Conference as a participant in determining Courthouse construction priorities.

Amendment No. 73. Restores House language authorizing GSA to accept and retain income to offset the cost of flexiplace work telecommuting centers.

Amendment No. 74. Restores House language authorizing the transfer of \$2.2 million to the Charles County Community College and repeals a previous authorization.

Amendment No. 75. Deletes House language providing transfer authority between "Operating Expenses" and "Policy and Oversight".

Amendment No. 76. Inserts and modifies Senate language prohibiting excessing land in the vicinity of Norfolk Lake, Arkansas by making the provision permanent.

Amendment No. 77. Inserts and modifies Senate language prohibiting excessing land in the vicinity of Bull Shoals Lake, Arkansas by making the provision permanent.

Amendment No. 78. Inserts Senate language amending previous language concerning a land transfer in Hawaii.

#### MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 79. Appropriates \$24,549,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,129,000 as proposed by the House.

#### NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 80. Appropriates \$199,633,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$193,291,000 as proposed by the House. Within this amount, the conferees have provided a total of \$1,482,000 for the Information Security Oversight Office. The conferees further recommend that the National Security Council continue to provide guidance and policy support to ISOO.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE REDUCTIONS

The conferees agree to apply the same level administrative reductions to the National Archives and Records Administration appropriation as were applied to other appropriations. The reduction totals \$1,482,000 and shall be applied to the following object classes at the discretion of the Archivist: 21, travel; 22, transportation of things; 23, communications and utilities; 24, printing, reproduction; 25, other services; 26, supplies and materials; and 31, equipment.

#### CATALOGING, ARCHIVING, AND DIGITIZING ACTIVITIES

The conferees agree to include \$4,500,000 for cataloging, archiving, and digitizing activities at the National Archives as detailed in the Senate report. However, the conferees expect the Archives to submit a finalized plan for the long-term requirements for these activities, including an estimate of the

total cost. The conferees require that the Archivist provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, detailing the National Archives and Records Administration five-year plan on the activities it desires to undertake in the areas of cataloging, archiving, and digitizing activities. The plan shall include detailed budget requirements for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and estimated requirements for the remaining years.

#### ARCHIVES FACILITIES AND PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES

##### REPAIRS AND RESTORATION

Amendment No. 81. Inserts Senate language appropriating \$1,500,000.

The conferees are aware of requirements that may exist for repair and alteration of Presidential Libraries around the country, especially the Hoover and Eisenhower libraries. The conferees direct that the National Archives submit a plan for any required repairs or alterations of the Hoover Presidential Library and the Eisenhower Presidential Library to the Committees on Appropriations.

#### NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION GRANTS PROGRAM

Amendment No. 82. Appropriates \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 83. Appropriates \$7,776,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,328,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 84. Appropriates \$88,000,000 instead of \$85,524,000 as proposed by the House and \$93,106,000 as proposed by the Senate and inserts language proposed by the Senate regarding health promotion programs.

Reductions from President's budget are as follows: \$14,423,000 from occupational testing; \$2,524,000 from Job Information Offices; \$2,720,000 from Regional Offices; \$808,000 from Federal Quality Institutes; \$140,000 from International Affairs Office; \$376,000 from Executive Direction; \$2,605,000 from Common Services; and \$2,200,000 from Research Office. The conferees provide an additional \$5,224,000 for office close-down costs.

#### SENIOR EXECUTIVE PAY

Members of the Senior Executive Service (SES), Senior Level, Senior Technical, Board of Contract Appeal Judges and other similarly situated Federal employees did not receive the 2 percent comparability raise granted to all other Federal employees on January 1, 1995. The conferees recognize that during this time of government reorganization and downsizing, it is especially important that the career executive leadership, which is bearing the burden of leading their agencies through this difficult period, be treated in a fair and equitable manner. Therefore, the conferees urge the President to provide the same comparability and locality increase announced for all other employees to these career executives in January, 1996.

Amendment No. 85. Makes available \$102,536,000 for insurance and retirement programs as proposed by the House instead of \$93,261,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86. Deletes House language prohibiting a reduction-in-force in the Office of Federal Investigations prior to June 30, 1996. The conferees agree that such a reduction in force should not take place before March 31, 1996.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 87. Restores House language regarding the title of this section.

Amendment No. 88. Restores and modifies House language allowing Federal agencies to reimburse OPM for examinations for common occupations by not allowing for delegation of examinations for Administrative Law Judges.

Amendment No. 89. Restores House language allowing OPM to withhold state taxes from payments to annuitants.

Amendment No. 90. Restores House language extending retirement provisions under the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act to individuals taking delayed buyouts.

Amendment No. 91. Restores House language allowing OPM to charge fees to other Federal agencies for the dissemination of employment information.

Amendment No. 92. Inserts Senate language changing reporting requirements for OPM on pay status of employees outside the continental U.S.

#### UNITED STATES TAX COURT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 93. Appropriates \$33,269,000 instead of \$32,899,000 as proposed by the House and \$33,639,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS THIS ACT

Amendment No. 94. Deletes House language prohibiting the establishment of offices outside the District of Columbia unless certain criteria are met.

Amendment No. 95. Deletes House language authorizing the payment of incentive awards.

Amendment No. 96. Deletes House language making reference to the Federal Quality Institute.

Amendment No. 97. Restores and modifies House language concerning the designation of Front Royal, Virginia, as a Customs Service Port of Entry by making the provision permanent.

Amendment No. 98. Restores House language providing that fifty percent of obligated balances may remain available for certain purposes.

Amendment No. 99. Restores House language establishing the rate of pay for the Chief of Police of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Amendment No. 100. Inserts Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 101. Inserts and modifies Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 102. Inserts Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 103. Inserts Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 104. Inserts and modifies Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 105. Inserts Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 106. Inserts Senate language clarifying intent by adding numismatic collectibles to list of covered items.

Amendment No. 107. Inserts and modifies Senate language regarding the Mint Revolving Fund.

Amendment No. 108. Deletes House language prohibiting funds in this Act to be used for abortions unless the life of the mother is endangered (addressed in amendment number 109).

Amendment No. 109. Inserts and modifies Senate language prohibiting the funds in this Act to be used for abortions unless the life of the mother is endangered or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest

modified so that this provision shall become effective once current contracts expire.

Amendment No. 110. Restores House language placing procurement authority for Tax Systems Modernization under the Secretary of the Treasury.

Amendment No. 111. Restores House language providing for relief of certain weekly periodical publications that have been adversely affected by a 1989 mail classification regulation designed to control the inclusion of loose supplements in magazines and similar publications.

Amendment No. 112. Deletes House language limiting training funds to topics that meet identified needs for knowledge skills, and abilities bearing directly upon the performance of official duties.

Amendment No. 113. Inserts Senate language increasing the amount the Secret Service can expend at one non-governmental property of a sitting President from \$75,000 to \$200,000 for security enhancements.

Amendment No. 114. Inserts Senate language prohibiting implementation of an ATF ruling pertaining to the citric acid content of vodka.

#### CITRIC ACID IN VODKA

Although conferees agree with the Senate proposal that no part of any appropriation made available in this Act shall be used to implement the ATF and Treasury decision ATF-360 (59 FR 67216, 12/29/94), which limited the amount of citric acid that could be added to vodka to 300 parts per million (PPM), the conferees recognize the complex nature of the various issues surrounding any standard of identity determination with respect to the labeling of vodka. There fore, the ATF is directed to conduct a study, in consultation with industry members, to determine whether a more reasonable industry standard can be established that better balances the interests of the consumer, the industry, and the government.

Amendment No. 115. Inserts Senate language requiring that Secret Service pay for scheduled overtime when they have worked at least 2 hours of unscheduled overtime for protective duties.

#### TITLE VI—GOVERNMENTWIDE GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

Amendment No. 116. Deletes House language regarding employment of non-U.S. citizens.

Amendment No. 117. Deletes House language prohibiting the use of grant funds for the acquisition of goods or services unless certain announcement criteria is met.

Amendment No. 118. Deletes Senate language limiting the number of political appointees.

Amendment No. 119. Inserts Senate language clarifying the use of energy savings from Federal agencies to permit 100% of savings to be used as contained in P.L. 102-393.

Amendment No. 120. Deletes House language on establishing the Commission on Federal Mandates.

Amendment No. 121. Deletes House language regarding the FDA Building.

Amendment No. 122. Restores and modifies House language prohibiting Federal training not directly related to the performance of official duties.

#### FEDERAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

The language in this section is intended to prohibit expenditure of Federal funds on training that is offensive to Federal workers and unnecessary in the prosecution of their official functions. The conferees in no way intend this legislation to prohibit any type of training that is necessary for Federal workers to effectively complete their assigned tasks. In particular, the conferees

agree that training that produces high levels of psychological stress may be absolutely necessary in the training of law enforcement officers, pilots, and other occupations that encounter high levels of stress in the course of official duties.

In addition, this language is not intended to affect any training for displaced workers designed to help them find new employment.

Amendment No. 123. Deletes House language prohibiting the use of the Exchange Stabilization Fund to bolster foreign currencies (addressed in amendment number 129).

Amendment No. 124. Deletes Senate language requiring the Executive Branch to report to Congress on detailees and where they are assigned.

Amendment No. 125. Inserts Senate language prohibiting the expenditure of funds for implementation of agreements in nondisclosure policies unless certain provisions are included.

Amendment No. 126. Inserts and modifies Senate language requiring mandatory use of FTS2000.

Amendment No. 127. Inserts Senate language addressing death benefit requirements for survivors of Secret Service officers.

Amendment No. 128. Inserts and modifies Senate language pertaining to future contract requirements for carrying mail in Alaska.

Amendment No. 129. Inserts and modifies Senate language regarding the Exchange Stabilization Fund; modified for technical corrections.

#### EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

The conferees agree that to assure continued United States government involvement in international monetary transactions—and the ability to continue to use the Exchange Stabilization Fund in the manner that the Congress has supported for over 60 years—this provision should allow for contemporaneous and confidential certification by the Secretary of the Treasury.

This need for confidentiality is supported by the market sensitivity of these transactions and is consistent with the confidential nature of the monthly reports that the Treasury has provided and continues to provide to the Banking Committees on a confidential basis.

Amendment No. 130. Inserts and modifies Senate language prohibiting a cost of living adjustment during 1996 for Members of Congress; modified to include Federal judges, and executive level personnel.

Amendment No. 131. Inserts Senate language transferring two seized and forfeited A-37 Dragonfly jets to the National Warplane Museum in Geneseo, NY for museum purposes.

Amendment No. 132. Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 133. Inserts Senate language banning tobacco vending machines in Federal buildings to which children have access.

Amendment No. 134. Deletes Senate language concerning direct delivery of high value supplies.

#### HIGH VALUE SUPPLIES AND DEPOT SYSTEM

The conferees direct that the General Services Administration should increase use of direct deliver high-dollar value supplies, and only stock items that are profitable, and review the depot system.

Amendment No. 135. Inserts and modifies Senate language establishing an Independent Commission on Restructuring the Internal Revenue Service by making technical corrections.

Amendment No. 136. Inserts and modifies Senate language requiring the Administrator of GSA to review the feasibility of leasing

agreements with state and local governments for the construction or acquisition of border facilities.

Amendment No. 137. Deletes Senate language requiring each agency to achieve a five percent reduction in energy costs during fiscal year 1996 and makes up to 50 percent of the savings available to the agency.

Amendment No. 138. Deletes Senate language reducing maximum leave that can be accumulated by members of the Senior Executive Service.

Amendment No. 139. Inserts Senate language transferring a building.

Amendment No. 140. Inserts and modifies Senate language providing law enforcement credit to law enforcement officers hired during the three year transition period before FERS was fully implemented.

Amendment No. 141. Deletes Senate language expressing sense of Senate that the GSA and FAA should review personnel rules and labor agreements regarding Federal assistance when relocating personnel because of a change of duty station.

#### DENVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT EMPLOYEE RELOCATION

The conferees are concerned about reports that, under FAA and GSA rules, employees in the Denver, Colorado area were permitted to claim personal housing relocation allowances in connection with their transfer from FAA facilities at Stapleton Field to the new Denver International Airport, even in some cases where an employee's new home was farther from the new job site than the employee's former home. This kind of misuse of public funds is unacceptable and insults American taxpayers. The conferees expect GSA and FAA to review and reform current personnel rules and labor agreements to avoid any repetition of this experience and to restrict relocation allowances to cases in which a job site transfer reasonably and proximately necessitates a change in home site.

#### CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1996 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1995 amount, the 1996 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1996 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995 .....	\$23,500,947,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996 .....	24,896,488,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996 .	23,177,286,500
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	23,141,970,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996 .....	23,163,754,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New Budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995 .....	— 337,193,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996 .....	— 1,732,734,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996 .....	— 13,532,500
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996 .....	+21,784,000

JIM LIGHTFOOT,  
FRANK R. WOLF,  
ERNEST ISTOOK,  
JACK KINGSTON,  
MIKE FORBES,  
BOB LIVINGSTON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

RICHARD C. SHELBY,  
JAMES M. JEFFORDS,  
BEN NIGHTHORSE  
CAMPBELL,

MARK O. HATFIELD,  
BOB KERREY,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

# NO TAX CUTS WHILE TRYING TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an editorial ran in yesterday's Houston Chronicle that affirmed what a lot of us have been saying for months. It is ridiculous to cut taxes at a time when the Federal Government is desperately trying to balance its budget. In fact, Congress' own analysts pointed out that the tax cut would needlessly add almost \$100 billion to the swollen national debt and increase taxes for working people who make under \$30,000. No one likes to pay taxes. It would be great to give every taxpayer a tax cut. We should balance our budget first.

Speaking of the budget, the new majority has been backslapping and congratulating themselves for weeks about passing a balanced budget, but wait a minute, there is a problem. I see on page 3 of the budget conference report, it says in the budget document in the year 2002 that we will have a \$108 billion deficit. Only in Washington could a deficit of \$108 billion be considered balanced in the year 2002, when we are supposed to have a balanced budget.

In their heart they know the budget is not balanced. All this pomp and celebration is one big joke on the seniors of this country. Do they know why? Yes, because that \$108 billion will come out of the Social Security trust fund to balance that budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from the Houston Chronicle of Tuesday, October 24, 1995.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 24, 1995]

## BREATH AND TAXES—BALANCED BUDGET SHOULD COME BEFORE ANY TAX CUT

Democrats are arguing that Republicans in Congress are trying to cut the taxes of the rich and the benefits of the poor. Republicans counter that the Democrats are waging a campaign of fear and class warfare.

There is some truth to both these charges, but most Americans are neither rich nor poor. They should view the political battle as logic vs. irrationality. So far, logic is losing.

Take for instance, the recent vote of the Senate Finance Committee to cut taxes by some \$245 billion. No American enjoys paying high taxes, but a large majority of Americans believe that the nation's No. 1 priority is lowering the federal deficit, a goal that the tax cut would make more difficult.

Republicans say they can cut taxes and still balance the budget in seven years. But Congress' own analysts point out that the tax cut would needlessly add almost \$100 billion to the swollen national debt—debt that no balanced budget will ever diminish.

Balancing the budget requires hard choices, such as the necessity to curb spending on Medicare. But why make the choices any harder than they have to be?

While the GOP tax cut would give parents a tax credit of up to \$500 per child, the Medicare plan would increase fees—taxes—on the elderly. What's the point of giving with one hand only to take away with the other?

The Republicans in Congress deserve the credit for their efforts to balance the budget. The Democrats who held sway for decades had the power to balance the budget—even when Republicans occupied the White House—but never did.

But with the tax cut, the Republicans erode the chances that the budget will actually be balanced in seven years and signal a fragile economy that their spirit may be willing, but their commitment is weak.

President Clinton has done little to clarify the debate. While vowing to veto the GOP tax cuts, he worried in Houston recently that he might have raised taxes too much in 1993 in his successful attempt to temporarily bring down the deficits. If taxes are too high, then why his opposition to reducing them? Now the president says he just misspoke, but such wavering at the top will not produce public understanding.

One can debate whether the GOP tax cuts amount to a "giveaway for the rich" (much of the money will flow out in dribs and drabs to the middle class). However, one feature of the Republican agenda would drastically affect the large number of Americans who make up the working poor.

There is a national consensus that the federal welfare system needs reform. Congress' proposed welfare reform would limit and eventually end welfare for hundreds of thousands of families, but the Republicans' inconsistent budget plan would reduce the Earned Income Tax Credit program that helps keep poor Americans on the job and off the welfare rolls.

How can members of Congress insist on passing a tax credit for middle-class parents if they have to make things tougher on the poorest families in order to pay for it and still balance the budget?

Conservatives argue that the Earned Income Tax Credit is rife with fraud and abuse, but the proper response is to step up enforcement against the abusers.

## THE CHOSEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the reconciliation legislation, that legislation which will end up controlling all spending and tax cuts to come before the Congress this year, is about choices. It is about choices that the Republicans have made for millions and millions of Americans. It is about the choice that they made to cut Medicare by \$270 billion. It is about the choice they made in those Medicare cuts, Medicaid cuts, to remove nursing home standards for the protection of our elderly, to remove our elderly from the entitlement of having nursing home care paid for if they and their families cannot afford it in the twilight of their lives. It is about the choices that they made to cut \$10 billion from student loans so that now America's students, their families, are deeper in debt to pay educational costs than any time in the history of this country. It is about the choices that they made to cut the school lunch program and to

cut back on nutrition programs for those who are the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. Speaker, those are the choices of the Republican Party in this budget reconciliation bill. Those are the choices that they made about this generation of Americans. Those are the choices they made about that generation of Americans that fought the world wars, that fought the Korean conflict, that fought in Vietnam, who fought hard for democracy, who fought hard to save Western civilization in its time of need, but the Republicans are not prepared to fight for their Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, we should fight as hard for their Medicare as they fought on the beaches of Normandy, or the beaches of Iwo Jima, or Okinawa, or in Korea. But we are going to cut that Medicare \$270 billion.

Why? Because the Republicans did not want to make other choices. They chose not to have high-income Americans continue to pay their fair share. In fact, what they chose was what the Wall Street Journal points out. The choose to give them a tax cut. As the Wall Street Journal said to the rich of this country, "Don't do anything yet, but start salivating." Why should they start salivating? Because the tax bill passed on Wednesday by the House of Representatives could turn out to be the biggest tax saving bonanza in years for upper-income Americans so we have \$270 billion in cuts in Medicare to pay for \$245 billion in cuts to some of the wealthiest people in this country. As we see, under the Republican plan, Mr. Speaker, 64 percent of the wealthy families in this country get a tax break, but 86 percent of middle-income families get a tax increase or they pay the same.

Those are choices that the Republicans have made in this proposal. They have chosen to give the wealthy, the rich, those who do not need a tax cut, a tax cut. They chose to pay for it by cutting the health care to our elderly, by cutting the health care to our poor, by cutting the health care to millions of Americans' children. They chose to pay for it by cutting student loans, and they chose to pay for it by cutting school lunches. They chose to create millions of desperately poor Americans so that they could take care of the wealthiest in this country.

They also chose to hold the Defense Department harmless. Everybody else has to contribute to balancing the budget, but not the Department of Defense.

They also chose to hold harmless corporate welfare, the large timber companies, the large mining companies, the large oil companies on which this bill lavishes billions of dollars in subsidies to those who do not need it, to some of the most profitable companies in this country. But those were the choices that the Republicans made. They chose to lead those people out of



the sacrifice that millions of Americans will be making in the coming years to balance the budget, to balance the budget so we can have a prosperous economy, but they chose that some would not have to enlist in that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, If you're very wealthy, you won't have to enlist in that fight. If you're a defense contractor, you won't have to enlist in that fight. If you're on the corporate welfare dole, you won't have to enlist in that fight. But if you're aged, or if you are a student seeking an education, or a child seeking nutrition, or a family seeking a safe, a safe and healthy, nursing home for your grandparents, or your parents, or your spouse, you have to enlist, and you have to pay, and you have to pay more because the Republicans chose that many of the well off in this country would have to pay less and not contribute at all.

#### THE REPUBLICANS ARE MAKING TOUGH DECISIONS WHILE BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. What? Are you putting your head in the sand and forgetting the deficit: This country is facing a deficit at a rate of \$37 million an hour. I ask the gentleman from California go out and show me one of your constituent families out there that can overspend their budget at the same percentage rate or proportionate to their own budget as this Federal Government overspends its budget. When are you going to come to your senses, my colleagues? We got to get this budget in balance. If we do not, there is no greater threat to the future of this country. There is nothing greater that is going to break the backbones of the working people of this country than allowing this country to continue to spend, and spend, and spend, and spend.

You can divert all the attention you want to away from what I am saying, but the fact is, if you do not do something about this deficit, the people in this country are going to face a fiasco, a financial fiasco the likes of which we have not seen.

Now the gentleman talks about Medicare, how horrible that we do something about a Medicare. My colleagues, we better do something about Medicare. It is going to be bankrupt. It was this body that created Medicare. It is a good program, it was intended for good purposes, but, as many other Federal programs, it has gotten out of hand, the spending has gone crazy. The trustees, bipartisan by the way, Democrat and Republicans, some of the trustees appointed by President Clinton, have come to a mutual agreement, and that is if we do not do something with Medicare, if we do not reform Medicare,

that system will be bankrupt, bankrupt by the year 2002.

Now sure it is easy to stand up here, and use lots of fancy charts, and quote this newspaper and that newspaper, but who is doing the hard work back here to stand up to government spending and say, "Enough is enough; you can't spend more than you bring in"?

I stopped one time a rancher. He told me in Colorado; Meeker, CO; said to me, "Scott, before you put any more water in the bucket you better plug the holes," and I venture to say to the gentleman from California that is exactly what this Republican bill does.

The Democrats have had an opportunity to bring this budget in balance for 25 years. They have refused to do it. We are not going to refuse to do it. Sure we are going to take heat from you, sure we are going to take cheap shots about this and that, and sure we have to make tough decisions, not necessarily between good and bad programs, but between good and good programs, but we are willing to make those decisions because, if we do not, you will not, and if you will not, this country faces a fiscal disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country deserve a government that can control its spending. The people of this country deserve a government that knows how to balance its checkbook. The senior citizens of this country deserve a Medicare Program that is not going to go bankrupt in 7 years.

□ 1945

The people of this country can expect their Congress to act in a responsible, a fiscally responsible manner. I would urge all Members to set aside the partisan politics and take a look at the best interests of this country. The best interest of this country is that this country quit spending more than it brings in.

#### SPEAKING FOR THE POOR CHILDREN OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the well this evening on behalf of a special interest group. This is not an ordinary special interest group. In fact, it is not a very effective one here in Washington. This special interest group does not have a Political Action Committee, they do not own a fax machine. In fact, they do not even vote. Yet, they are an interest group which is going to be affected by a bill which is on the floor of the House of Representatives tomorrow. I am speaking for them because, frankly, very few people this evening on the Republican side of the aisle want to acknowledge this group.

The special interest group I am speaking on behalf of are the poor children in America, the poor children in America who rely almost exclusively

on a program known as Medicaid. It is a health care program for kids from lower income families. The Medicaid Program provides for immunizations for these children, health screening, examinations, and if they get very sick, it provides for their hospital care.

The Republican plan, which the gentleman from Colorado just described, is going to make a massive cut in this Medicaid Program. As a direct result of it, many of the poor children in America who are sick will not have health care, quality health care, available to them.

Yesterday morning I visited La Rabida hospital in Chicago. It is an amazing hospital. Eighty-five percent of the revenue to this hospital comes from this Medicaid Program. It is a beautiful hospital with wonderful people, doctors and nurses and administrators, and they took us on a tour and gave us a chance to meet some of the children; great kids, very sick children, but kids who, with their parents, are fighting a struggle every day to make it. They are fighting it, and the resources they use are the Medicaid Program.

I met Robert. Robert is a perfect kid, perfect except for diabetes. But if you meet him and you see his smile and his attitude, you think "I want to give this kid a chance. I want Medicaid to be there to pay his hospital bill, so that he has a chance in life." Yet, the Republican side is suggesting that Robert and many like him are, frankly, casualties of this budget debate.

The gentleman from Colorado a few minutes ago was chiding us for saying the Democrats can never tell us where to cut spending. Let me give a couple of examples in his own Republican reconciliation bill where they can cut spending. First, let me go back to this chart. Do you not think at a time when we are cutting health care for Robert under Medicaid, that we ought to think twice about giving 64 percent of the wealthy families in America a tax break, a tax cut? These are the wealthiest families in this country, making over \$150,000 a year, and the Republicans believe they need a tax cut. This is not new. The Republicans have traditionally believed that if you make the rich rich enough, it will help working families.

Democrats see it a little differently. We are worried about the fact that 86 percent of middle-income families are going to see a tax increase. If you want to come up with some money to pay for Robert and for other children under Medicaid, let me suggest to my Republican friends, take out the benefits for the fat cats in your bill, take out the tax breaks for the wealthiest families. If we are going to reduce the deficit and not hurt poor children like Robert, do not go after those kids for the benefit of wealthy families.

Let me also give you another idea, if you want to save \$17 billion. The Republicans close a loophole which has existed in the law. They are going to

allow alternate income, minimum income, for corporations not to be taxed. Let me tell you what that means. If a corporation is profitable in this country and has hired a sufficient number of attorneys and accountants to escape all tax liability, the Republicans say "Fine, great, let them off the hook. They pay nothing," even though they made a profit.

We decided under President Reagan, not a screaming liberal, under President Reagan, to put an alternate minimum tax and say that every corporation has to pay something if it is profitable. Is that unreasonable? I do not think it is; \$17 billion will be taken out of Medicaid for poor children for their health care.

Let me tell you what it means in our State of Illinois. When these cuts are being made, it means that in my State of Illinois, 128,000 children in Illinois, poor children, will not get quality health care. That is what is part of this Republican plan. They tell us they are going to balance the budget. They have not told us what we are going to do about Robert and his diabetes. They have not told us what we are going to do about La Rabida hospital, Children's Memorial Hospital, Wyler's Children's Hospital, Presbyterian St. Luke's, Children's Hospital, that depend on Medicaid to serve these poor children.

I stand tonight to speak on behalf of this special interest group. They are never going to come to my fundraisers. They are not going to send me a PAC check. They do not own a fax machine, they cannot fax a message, but these kids are going to be nailed this week by the Republican budget plan. It is totally unnecessary. For at least those kids and their families, I hope the people of this country will contact their Members of Congress and urge them to vote against the Gingrich Republican budget plan.

#### ITEMS RELATED TO THE BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to recognizing the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will alternate recognition for 5-minute special orders.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, did you run out of people for the 5-minute special order list?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair entertains requests on the spot.

Mr. MILLER of California. For unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For unanimous consent.

Mr. MILLER of California. I object, Mr. Speaker. We have people who have been waiting who were on the list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All these special orders are 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thought you had to be on the list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All names on the list have been completed.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly discuss several items which are directly or indirectly related to the budget reconciliation presently before us.

First, let me say that no one has cornered the market on compassion. No one has a monopoly on virtue.

Yet some around here seem to believe that they have.

Every time any budget cut is proposed, we are told that it is mean spirited, or that it shows a lack of compassion.

Yet what really lacks compassion is for the Federal Government to take so much money from families that they don't have enough money left to support their children in the way they should.

This is what is happening in this country today where the average person has to pay half of his or her income now in taxes when you count taxes of all types, Federal, State, and local—sales, property, income, gas, Social Security, and so forth.

What really shows a lack of compassion is an unwillingness to cut anything so that we can get federal spending under control.

What really shows a lack of compassion is to continue running up large deficits so that we absolutely destroy the economic futures of our children.

What really shows a lack of compassion is to tell the people of this country, through votes on this floor, that bureaucrats can spend their hard-earned money for them better than they can themselves.

And let me say something else—almost every leading economist tells us that our \$5 trillion national debt really holds this country back economically.

Times are good for some now. But they could and should be good for everyone. People who are making \$5 to \$6 an hour could and should be making \$10 or \$12 an hour.

It sure isn't compassionate to let our national debt get even higher so that the gap between the rich and the poor keeps growing.

The choice is simple. Are we going to side with overpaid and underworked bureaucrats, or are we going to side with the average people who are footing the bill.

Second, I could live with a lower tax cut than \$245 billion. But let's put this in perspective.

This is not an all-at-once cut. It is spread over 7 years.

This cut comes out to less than 2 percent—less than 2 percent—of Federal spending over this period.

This follows a 15-year period during which Federal spending has gone up almost 300 percent.

The first Reagan budget was \$581 billion. We're spending almost triple that now.

Federal spending has gone up 300 percent in the last 15 years—is it asking too much to give back less than 2 percent?

Seventy percent of this tax cut goes to people making less than \$50,000 a year. Do we ever think about that?

Most Republicans support flat tax which totally excludes people making less than \$26,000 or couples making less than \$38,000 from Federal income taxes altogether.

Do you ever think about that? Who is really for lower income people—someone who wants to keep their taxes high like now, or someone who wants to greatly reduce their taxes.

Third, last week we passed a Medicare bill that provides for a huge increase in Medicare spending.

In Tennessee, we now spend approximately \$5,000 per year on the average recipient of Medicare. This will go up to over \$7,000, an increase of \$2,000 over the next 7 years.

This bill provides for an increase in Medicare spending at twice the rate of inflation. And this is called a cut.

There is no disagreement that Medicare is going broke. The President's own trustees tell us this.

Is it compassionate to sit around and let it go under. Is it right just to fix it until after the next election.

The Medicare bill we passed may not be perfect. But it is sure not a cut; it is a huge increase.

Fourth, we will spend \$4 billion in Haiti by the time our troops pull out next February.

Now, the President wants to send 20,000 to 25,000 troops to Bosnia. We are already paying almost one third of the so-called peacekeeping costs there now. We will end up spending billions in Bosnia, too, if we are not careful, and the situation in these places is going to go right back the way it was as soon as we stop pouring our billions and billions into those places.

We should not send young American men and women to fight and die on foreign battlefields, Mr. Speaker, unless there is a vital U.S. interest present, or unless there is a real threat to our national security. Neither of these is present in Bosnia.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that when I got home last Thursday night, I read in the USA Today that Allen Greenspan is planning through the Federal Reserve Board to spend billions to prop up the Japanese financial system. We should not be doing that, Mr. Speaker. Our obligation should be to the American taxpayers, and not to the big Japanese banks. They would not bail us out if we got in financial trouble, and we should not be bailing out their big banks with billions of our dollars at this time.

#### RURAL AMERICA AND THE IMPACT OF BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, how a nation spends its resources says volumes about who is important, who is not, which regions of our Nation are favored and which are ignored.

When we vote on budget reconciliation this week, this Nation will know the winners and losers.

This budget will cause pain to many in America, but we will cause substantial harm to most in rural America.

Rural North Carolina, including my congressional district, like most of rural America, is struggling to provide a minimum quality of life for its citizens.

These communities, however, lack high-paying jobs and often lack the infrastructure necessary for economic expansion.

The lack of basic resources and opportunities, such as employment, housing, education, and utility services, especially water and sewer, is compounded by limited access to quality health care and a shortage of health professionals, especially primary and family physicians.

As Congress goes through its cost cutting, deficit reducing, budget balancing exercise, there is a message that needs to be emphasized among our colleagues: Farmers and rural communities have been important to this Nation's past, and farmers and rural communities are essential to this Nation's future, most notably, the small, family farmers.

Today, I want to briefly discuss two of the areas affected by the Republican budget reconciliation legislation, and I will begin with agriculture programs.

#### AGRICULTURE

Agriculture faces deeper, across-the-board cuts in Federal programs, such as the cotton and dairy programs, the food and nutrition programs, and the rural development and housing programs.

Agricultural cuts have been going on for years, \$50 billion since 1981, but these are especially painful because of the nature of the cuts and in light of all the other cuts.

The freedom to farm proposal offered by the House Agriculture Committee chairman—which will be part of the reconciliation package—contains \$13.4 billion in additional cuts to farm programs over the next 7 years.

How much muscle and bone do we have to cut from the body of agriculture?

Why should we compensate for a \$245 billion tax cut for the wealthy, by destroying a mainstay of rural life—the American farmer?

My primary opposition to the Freedom to Farm Act is that the link between prices and production will be severed as a result of these severe cuts. A fixed payment that disregards market price cannot possibly provide the help necessary when market prices are lower, while providing unnecessary payments when prices are high.

I am also apprehensive about the availability of production financing,

which will most certainly diminish as the agricultural safety net disappears.

And, my final concern is that the Freedom to Farm Act is solely concerned with the next 7 years—but what will farmers and farm communities do after 2002?

The Freedom to Farm Act will reduce farm income by 5 percent in 1998. Over the next 5 years, it has been estimated that net farm income will drop by an average of \$1.5 billion per year for a total of \$7.5 billion—that's \$7.5 billion lost from farm income to pay for an unfair tax cut. I do not consider that to be fair or just—do you?

Congress needs to address agriculture in a fair and measured way—97 percent of the population of the United States is fed by the 3 percent of farmers.

The Freedom to Farm Act is neither fair nor is it prudent.

The name is deceptive—instead of freedom to farm it should be called freedom to fail.

#### EDUCATION

In the area of education, more than 100,000 rural children will be denied basic and advanced skills, at a time when many small towns and rural communities are having a difficult struggle with their budgets.

Rather than promoting education, this bill is an obstruction to education and is disastrous to small and rural education systems.

Thousands of disadvantaged children who need a little help in the beginning of their lives—at the onset of their education—will not get that help.

Head Start is cut by \$137 million—abandoning 180,000 children nationwide and almost 4,000 in North Carolina.

Title I is cut by \$1.1 billion—denying critical basic and advanced skills assistance to 1.1 million students nationwide and 20,400 students in North Carolina.

Drug-free schools is cut by 59 percent—this program is currently used by 129 of the 129 school districts in North Carolina.

The program is designed to keep crime, violence, and drugs away from students and out of our schools. And, the Republican majority wants to gut the program.

The Goals 2000 Program is completely eliminated—381 schools in North Carolina will be denied this vital program.

And, Vocational Education is cut by 27 percent.

Thousands of those school children, willing to work, who have found hope in a mountain of hopelessness, will not be able to work. The School-to-Work Program is cut by 22 percent. Americorps, the National Service Program, is eliminated, denying an opportunity to 1,107 young people in North Carolina.

And, the summer jobs program is eliminated altogether. Some 9,000 young people in North Carolina will be put out of work for 1996 and some 61,000 will be out of work in our State by the year 2002. And, sadly, Mr. Speaker, that includes the 22 young people who wrote me that letter.

The privilege of an education belongs to all in America.

But, education cuts of the majority, with the stroke of a pen, takes that privilege away from many low income and rural children.

This blind march to a balanced budget, without considering the merits of programs, is taking us down the wrong path.

I wonder where it is taking our young people?

Where is the balance in this kind of budget?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, when we consider budget reconciliation, let us not forget rural America.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, the vote tomorrow represents the very essence of why I was sent to Congress.

One year ago I made a commitment to my constituents that I would balance the budget and save the future of our country from irresponsible reckless spending and ever higher debt and national bankruptcy.

That is what I will vote to do tomorrow.

A child born today will pay an average of \$187,000 in taxes over his or her lifetime just to pay off the interest on the national debt, not to mention the principal.

This is unconscionable; we have to balance the budget and begin to relieve our children of this unfair burden.

But the positive impact of this bill will be felt much sooner by current generations as well.

One can always find excuses not to balance the budget.

A balanced budget will help lower interest rates, making it easier for families to finance the purchase of homes, cars, and college educations.

It will create jobs, and maintain a rising standard of living for us and our children.

In short, the package contains the most important goals of the 104th Congress: a balanced budget, tax relief, welfare reform, and Medicare solvency.

In stark contrast to Congresses of years past, today we present the American people with a responsible plan not of ever higher taxes and rapidly increasing programs, but of serious prioritizing and meaningful tax relief for working parents and their children.

The reconciliation package sets the budget on a 7-year glidepath toward eliminating the deficit by the year 2002.

Balancing the budget is simply good economic policy.

It will result in lower interest rates, a more vibrant private sector, and a reduction in the huge and growing part of our budget comprised of interest payments on our debt.

But this is also a moral imperative.

In effect, continuing to heap debt upon future generations for our short-term benefits taxes our posterity without their consent, all because, until now, we have lacked the will to make difficult decisions on budgetary matters.

Balancing the budget is the overall aim of this package, but the bill also provides some much needed and significant tax relief for the working families of America.

This bill provides families a \$500 per child tax credit, helping the middle class save and pay for college, braces, clothes, or whatever.

The point is that families, not the government, will be empowered to make decisions for themselves.

American innovators will seize upon the capital gains tax reduction as an opportunity to invest in new businesses and create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, better jobs than any government bureaucrat can ever imagine creating.

And the bill provides tax relief for seniors, repealing the 1993 Clinton tax increase on Social Security.

Also included in the bill are the provisions of the Medicare Preservation Act that saves Medicare from bankruptcy.

Solvency is achieved in a fair and reasonable manner, containing no increase in deductibles or copayments, and no changes in the rate of premium growth while offering more choices to Medicare beneficiaries than ever before.

Long overdue welfare reform is also in there.

We put an end to the Great Society notions that Washington knows best without abandoning our commitments to the Nation's poorest and most vulnerable.

As poverty rates hover around 1965 levels and illegitimacy rates skyrocket, this Congress has taken action and ended the cruel cycle of dependency and encourages workfare, not welfare.

Thirty years and \$5 trillion of misguided spending are enough: welfare reform is long overdue.

Let's contrast this overall plan with that espoused by our President only a few short years ago.

On June 4, 1992, he promised a balanced budget.

A Democrat Congress never delivered.

He promised a tax cut for middle-class families.

A Democrat Congress never delivered.

Worse than never delivering, they actually implemented the biggest tax increase in the history of our Nation.

And now, the President has even admitted he raised our taxes too much.

He never offered a plan to end welfare as we know it, and he stayed on the sidelines as we saved Medicare from going bankrupt.

This Congress is about keeping promises, not breaking them.

In the end, I will cast my vote for a bill that fulfills my commitment to the people who sent me here.

The last election was a clear statement by my constituents: They want a balanced budget and a smaller Government that works more efficiently for them.

They want a Congress committed to solving problems, not avoiding them.

They want a Congress that keeps its promises, and gets the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that this is what we will give them tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I have been here during these special order sessions for several nights to inform the public about what is in the fine print of the Republican budget package.

I think our efforts are starting to pay off. The people of America are becoming aware of the enormity of the cuts in this reconciliation package and their effects on the children, the working poor, the disabled, and the elderly.

Sen. ARLEN SPECTER speaking on the GOP budget:

... much of the pain of the spending cuts goes to the elderly, the young and the infirm while allowing tax cuts for corporate America...

This is a Republican.

Not included on this list is the group that stands to gain the most from the Republican package; The wealthiest Americans. The Republicans are financing tax cuts for their rich by increasing taxes on the middle-class and low-income working Americans.

Republicans claim they are helping the poor by reforming welfare, however, it is dishonest to say that you believe in work over welfare and then cut the earned income tax credit and Medicaid.

Again, Jack Kemp.

I hope you guys do not go too far on removing the EITC because that is a tax increase on low-income workers and the poor which is unconscionable at this time...

In Florida, 1.3 million low-income workers and their families depend on the E.I.T.C. The working poor are barely getting by as it is, and now the Republicans are pulling the rug out from under them by cutting a program that was expanded by both Presidents Reagan and Bush.

The Republican welfare reform plan, which is part of the bill, includes additional impediments to work, such as underfunding child care support services and underfunding the workfare requirement. The Republican plan is weak on work and tough on kids.

Republicans talk about freedom and choice for the States. But the cuts in this plan will do nothing but force Governors to abandon any creative programs they have been able to initiate. Instead, Governors will be spending their time trying to stretch limited dollars to provide basic services for the poor and the elderly.

The inconsistency in the Republican agenda is confusing. Are they for work, or are they for further injuring the working poor? Are they for allowing Governors to be creative and innovative in developing programs or are they

for dumping the social problems of the Nation on the Governors while denying them the funds necessary to address the problems?

The plan to block grant the Medicaid Program will be disastrous for Florida. Shifting from a program designed to meet individual needs to a capped program constrains a State's ability to meet health care demands. People will either be kicked off of Medicaid, or State taxes will have to be raised. A block grant formula allows for little flexibility to address not only variable economic conditions, but also events like natural disasters that increase the Medicaid need.

While I do not support block granting Medicaid, if that is the framework within which we are operating, let us at least make the formula a fair one.

Today, I went before the Rules Committee to offer an amendment to make the Medicaid funding formula equitable.

Under my formula, Governors who use their Medicaid dollars efficiently would receive a bigger increase in their Medicaid grant. My formula encourages efficiency and the innovative use of Medicaid dollars.

We need to correct the fundamental unfairness underlying the Republican Medicaid funding formula. Under their proposal, Florida is among the eight States that will shoulder fully one-half of the \$182 billion in cuts. Over the 7 years of the Republican plan, Florida will lose between \$9 and \$11 billion.

The formula I offered was proposed to me by the Joint Legislative Auditing Committee of the Florida Legislature. It allows for adjustments in calculations to reflect increases in a State's elderly population, and increases in the number of people in poverty.

Florida and other high growth States should not be penalized for increases in our population. We also should not be penalized for being efficient in our use of funds. Under the current plan, if a State has profited at the expense of the system, in some cases bordering on outright fraud, it gets rewarded with higher block grant numbers. To remedy this error and to encourage proper use of funds, my formula rewards States that use Medicaid dollars effectively and efficiently.

But I will be denied the opportunity to offer my amendment tomorrow. This is just another reason why I cannot support the Republican reconciliation plan.

I am glad America is listening. We will continue to try to get our voices heard so that Americans will know and understand the devastation that will result from the Republican plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to rise in opposition to the reconciliation bill that is before the House today and tomorrow. For those who are not aware of this, the reconciliation bill is the budget bill, and

in it we are supposed to reconcile taxes and spending.

I believe that a budget bill should be a statement of our national values and how we spend our money is a statement of those values, and how we tax and who we tax is a statement of our sense of values in our country. I do not think that this reconciliation bill before the House meets any test that our constituents would have as a statement of values, a statement of national values, and a statement of a sense of fairness in our country. Indeed, in trying to achieve a balanced budget financially, we are indeed producing a lopsided budget way out of balance in terms of values and meeting the needs of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I was at an event and they asked me what the three biggest challenges to America were. What are the three biggest issues? As a Member of Congress, they wanted to know what I would name as the three issues.

□ 2015

I said, that is easy. The three biggest issues in our country are our children, our children, and our children. The sad thing about this legislation before us, the Republican majority reconciliation bill, is the devastation that it wreaks on children.

Our colleagues are fond of saying on the other side of the aisle that this puts us on a glide path to a balanced budget. It puts us on a glide path to a crash.

Because unless we invest in our children, we will never have a balanced budget. Unless we invest in our children and our families, we will not be able to produce the productive people that we need to keep our country competitive. Instead, we will continue, as this bill calls for, a continuation of the Republican notion of trickle down.

But it is on the issue of children that I would like to speak this evening. Because, as I say, if it is a statement of values of what we stand for as a country, it should be a statement of how we care for our children.

I do not think any of our listeners or viewers would consider it a statement of their values to cut millions of children out of Medicaid, guaranteed health care, in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in America. At the same time, I do not think our constituents consider it a statement of their values for us to give a tax break that the overwhelming majority of it benefits the top 6 percent earners in our country, the wealthiest people in our country.

Do not take it from me, though. Listen to what a Republican has to say. My colleague from Florida already referenced Senator SPECTER's remarks when he said, "Much of the pain of the spending cuts goes to the elderly, the young and the infirm, while allowing tax cuts for corporate America."

Senator SPECTER then also went on to say, "I suggest to my Republican

colleagues that we all rethink support for a combination of tax cuts and spending cuts that may lead to the perception of the Republican Party as the party of wealth, power and privilege, and not the party of ordinary workers."

As you can see here, Jack Kemp also had his concerns about what is in this bill. Jack Kemp, a leading light in the Republican Party, said, "I hope you guys do not go too far on removing the earned income tax credit, because that is a tax increase on low-income workers and the poor, which is unconscionable at this time."

Of course, the earned income tax credit is cut back in this bill. That is a tax credit that is given to the working poor in our country. Some of us view it as a subsidy for an unfair low minimum wage in our country, and it benefits America's businesses as much as it benefits the families. But no matter what, it does benefit the families. But we have to cut that back—a tax credit for the working poor—in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in our country.

Who was it who said that, to listen to this debate, one would think that the poor people had too much money and the rich people did not have enough?

But let us get on to the children.

The Republican budget reveals the Medicaid program as we know it which provides health security to 36 million low-income Americans. Half of the beneficiaries are children. Consumers Union estimates that the Medicaid provisions in this bill will result in 12 million Americans losing health insurance coverage in the cutbacks that are proposed. The majority are uninsured children.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just, in closing, say that we all care about our children. We want the best for our children. But unless we understand that the well-being of our own children is directly connected to the well-being of poor children of America, our own children will not be well-served. That is the reconciliation we must provide for our country.

I urge our colleagues to vote "no" on the Republican glidepath to a crash.

#### PREVENT THE RAID ON AMERICAN PENSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am only in my second term in Congress, but I remember last year one of the issues I heard a great deal was how many Members of Congress when we passed one of those massive bills has read the bill.

I would like to throw that down today as a challenge for the folks who happen to be watching tonight, Mr. Speaker, in that they would look at both H.R. 2491 and H.R. 2517, and to-

morrow we are getting ready to vote on this bill. I am sure the reason all our colleagues are not here is they are pouring over the pages of these bills tonight before they vote on them and I hope they would because if they had the chance to look at this, they would also see one section I am going to talk about tonight.

This morning, members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities that I am a member of and the Committee on the Budget held a press conference in a joint effort to alert American workers and retirees what effect the bill will have on their pension plans.

Several weeks ago, Republicans in the Committee on Ways and Means proposed changes in the Internal Revenue Code allowing employers to take assets from pension plans and use them for any purpose. This dangerous proposal would allow companies to take money from employee pension plans that they say are more than 125 percent funded. Those excess pension assets, the funds not needed to pay immediate pension benefits, can be used freely for purposes that may not certainly be in the interest of those retirees or potential retirees.

Allowing companies to strip so-called surplus pension assets from the employee pension plans would take us back to the early 1980's, when companies took away \$20 billion from over 2,000 pension plans, covering nearly 2.5 million workers and retirees.

Prior to the 1980's, the reversions of pension assets to employers were almost nonexistent. Pension assets were returned to employers only after the plan had been terminated and after all benefits to plan participants were paid. However, as pension assets grew because of the inflation in the late 1970's and the rising stock market of the 1980's, corporations began to take these excess pension funds.

In fact, in 1983, the Reagan administration issued guidelines making pension reversions easier, in other words, to get at that pension increase. From 1982 to 1990, over \$20 billion was taken from the over 2,000 retirement plans covering those 2.5 million workers and retirees. From 1982 to 1985, the size of the reversion grew rapidly: \$404 million reverted in 1982 alone to \$6.7 billion reverted in 1985.

As retirees were left without adequate retirement, Congress took strong action to stem the tide of the pension reversions or the raiding of the pension funds. Beginning in 1986, Congress imposed a series of excise taxes. A 10-percent excise tax on the amount of the reversion was in the Tax Reform Act of 1986, a 15-percent excise tax in the Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988, and in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 a 20-percent tax was on employers who established a successor plan with similar benefits or they had to pay a 50-percent tax if no successor plan was established. So they

could not just come in and raid the taxes, the pension plans from 1986 to 1990.

So with these congressional measures, the number and size of the reversions substantially fell. So today we see increased pension plans, the assets of the pension plans that, by the way, Mr. Speaker, they are investing in our country. We hope they are investing in jobs and in our country. So it is for savings, but that money is not sitting somewhere and not earning money because we want those retirees to earn from the benefits of our country.

The effect of the reversion on the American worker in the Republican proposal would encourage employers to take billions of dollars out of these pension plans, leaving them possibly with insufficient funds to protect the future of current retirees. Money previously set aside for workers' retirement would now be pocketed by these same corporations and used for any purpose over that 125 percent.

The removal of these funds from pension plans increases the risk of loss to workers, retirees and their beneficiaries at a time when the need to make sure we have a strong pension system is great, when we worry about if social security is going to be there. And we all talk about that Social Security is not where people can survive on but it is just a beginning, and here we are going to hurt private pension plans by allowing employers to take money from them.

Pension plans are not the employers' money. Workers pay into those pension contribution funds and oftentimes accept lower wages, and I did that in the 1970's. We actually accepted, when I was in the printing business, a lower amount in our paycheck to make sure we paid into the pension plan. So today, Mr. Speaker, I am now a beneficiary of the printers pension that I do not know how much I will receive when I am 65.

But under the current pension and tax regulations, pension funds are in trust to be used only for the exclusive benefit of workers and retirees and should not be considered as piggy banks. This irresponsible provision encourages efforts to pilfer workers' pensions. This proposal is bad public policy.

A pension plan with excess assets today can quickly become underfunded if those assets are taken away. Because most pension plans are tied to the stock market, any downward turn will have a negative effect on the plan. In addition, a reduction in the interest rate of 1 percentage point, together with an asset reduction of 10 percent, reduces the funding level from 125 percent to 96 percent.

The American public must let the majority Republicans in Congress know that pension assets are held in trust for the exclusive benefit of plan participants and their beneficiaries. Taking money away from pension plans will reverse the progress made to

increase the national savings rate. Let us not permit companies to take pension assets from the American worker. Let us ensure that pensions will be safe and available for those who saved for their retirement.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would hope that our majority tomorrow would realize what it will do to the future of the pension plans and, hopefully, the U.S. Senate will change that or, as Secretary Reich said today, this is veto bait in this bill.

#### REPUBLICANS TURN BACKS ON FAMILY FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I come before you tonight to discuss the shameful way the Republican Members of Congress are treating the American single family farmer with the farm and reconciliation bills.

The Republicans are treating our farmers like a bunch of ruined chickens, throwing them into the equivalent of the legislative compost heap, to slowly decompose, to rot, to wither, and then to simply waste away.

I am a member of the House of Committee on Agriculture, and I listen and read what the Republican Members have proposed. I know that the Republicans, as usual, have decided to choose sides with the big, rich corporations, rather than with American farm families.

America needs more than this. America expects more than this. Republicans always side with the big corporations. Republicans always promote the interests of the rich over the working people. Republicans have no remorse when it comes to bleeding and starving our farm families until they have absolutely nothing left, no profit, no home, and no hope for a future.

America is a great Nation today, not because we have a mighty military but because we can feed our military and our citizens, and, of course, the rest of the world.

The majority of the Republicans in this country are gung ho when it comes to funding the military. Look at the budgets that they propose. When it comes to investing in our farmers, they shun them, turn their backs on them, and in essence they are saying we Republicans do not need family farmers. After all, they are expendable, because we have big corporate farmers that can farm huge farms and make big profits.

Yes, America is great today because we can feed the world. And Americans can feed the world because in the past this Congress has had the wisdom to invest in our farm families.

Some people would have you believe that all the farmers have a bag of Federal subsidies and moneys that they do not need and to eliminate this country's debt, we must eliminate all of the farm programs. Well, the truth is that

the Republicans are still trying to pass the buck on to other people so that they can give their friends multibillion-dollar tax cuts, their rich friends.

What the Republicans will not tell Americans and what they will not tell our family farmers is that all of this money that they are saving will go to the rich, not to reducing the debt. I will tell you something else, that is a shame.

Most farmers are good, patriotic Americans. As most patriots will do, they have volunteered to eliminate many vital farm programs so that they can do their part in eliminating this Republican Reagan-Bush-caused deficit. Well, fair is fair and enough is enough.

The Republicans always talk a good talk when it comes to supporting families and family values. But when it comes to delivering on these promises, they always side with business and the wealthy. I hope all farmers have learned this lesson and remember it when election time comes rolling around again.

The Republicans have drafted a farm bill. As a matter of fact, they have drafted two. But neither one passed because the Republicans girdlocked on the committee. The Republicans simply cannot decide how much they want to take from the American farmers.

Ironically, the Republicans call their farm bill the Freedom to Farm Act. Unfortunately for our farmers under this Republican bill, no one will have the freedom to farm but large, big corporations.

□ 2030

The Republicans have turned their backs on the family farmers, and it is a shame, a dirty, rotten, Republican shame.

America is a world power because of our family farmer and what they have historically done for this country, and I for one am grateful to them for their sacrifices and all that they have done to make this country great.

I feel that we in Congress must protect them by voting against this reconciliation bill and the farm bill when it comes before this Congress.

#### GETTING OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting in my office, and I have been hearing some of the most partisan, outrageous comments I have heard in the history of this place, and I guess that is saying a lot.

I have been in office 20 years now. I was 30 years in the statehouse in Hartford, CT, and now 7, almost 8 years now, in Congress, and I remember my time in the statehouse looking at

Members of Congress and looking up to them but wondering how they could, how they would be allowed to, and why they would spend more money than they raised in taxes and why they would deficit spend. I knew I could not do that in the statehouse. I knew that in the statehouse that we had to spend only what we raised in taxes. If we spent more, we would have a deficit, and we were not allowed to by law.

I just think that it is immoral for a country that gets, in a sense, I hear the imagery of a farmer, I will use that same imagery, our forefathers gave us a farm and it did not have much debt, and this generation has mortgaged the farm to the hilt and is passing it on to the next generation with so much debt you can hardly pay the bills, and that is where we were at. We are here because 20 years of deficit spending has put us in the mess we are in.

I am not going to say that it is the Democrats' fault, because it is not. We had a Congress on one side which was mostly Democrat. You had a Republican Presidency for most of that time. The White House, Republicans did not want to cut defense, or at least they did not even want to control the growth of defense. You had Democrats who did not want to control entitlements. You had Republicans who thought there was no defense program that they did not want to spend money on, and you had Democrats who realized that half the budget are entitlements, and they continued to go up and up. So Republicans did not give in on defense, and Democrats did not give in on entitlements. The end result is we have had one deficit after another.

I vowed when I was elected that I would be part of a process to help get our financial house in order, and that is what we are doing. The sad thing is we are doing it now without the help of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that know we have to get our financial house in order, and we are doing it without the help of the President.

I am as proud as I could be to be part of this effort to get our financial house in order. We want to do that and balance the budget.

The second thing we want to do is save our trust funds, particularly Medicare which needs to be protected and preserved and strengthened. It is going insolvent next year. It goes bankrupt in 7 years, totally bankrupt.

The third thing we want to do is we want to change the social, corporate, and farming welfare state into an opportunity society. I look at this, and I say how can anyone justify 4 miles of public housing in Chicago, 17-story buildings, that is the legacy of the welfare state; the legacy of the welfare state, our 13-year-olds having babies, 14-year-olds selling drugs, 16-year-olds killing each other, 18-year-olds who cannot even read their diplomas, 24-year-olds who have never had a job, 30-year-old grandparents. We have got to change that.

In our society we become a caretaking society instead of a caring society. What ultimately has to happen is Republicans and Democrats, one, have to realize we have to balance the budget. I would like it in 4 years. If it takes 7, so be it. We have to get our financial house in order.

The second thing we have to do, clearly, is decide how we do that. We have a disagreement with the White House right now. The White House does not want to weigh in on a 7-year budget. They are going to have to do that. The one thing I am not giving in on is to continue to say we are going to balance the budget out years and years out, but the President does not have to take our 7-year budget. The Democrats do not have to take our 7-year budget. If they do not like that, they can come in with a proposal as some of them have, but the bottom line is we have to get our financial house in order.

I hear the dialog about cutting things, cutting school lunch programs. No. They are going up 4.5 percent each year. Yes, they would have gone up 5.2 percent. We think they should go up 4.5 percent.

Cutting Medicare? Give me a break. Medicare, we are going to spend \$1.6 trillion in the next 7 years. The last 7 years we spent about \$900 billion. It is going to go up over \$675 billion. We are going to spend 75 percent more in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7, 75 percent more, excuse me, 73 percent more. Only in this place where the virus is fed, where you spend 73 percent more, do people say it is a cut.

In this year compared to the 7th year, we are going to spend 54 percent more. The 7th year, in Medicare, 54 percent more than today. People say you have more beneficiaries. Even if you take it on that, we are going to spend \$4,800 per beneficiary today, \$4,800. It is going to go up to \$6,700 in the 7th year. That is a 40-percent increase. Only in this place when you spend 40 percent more per beneficiary do people call it a cut.

Are we going to force people out of Medicare into private care? No. They can stay where they are. They have no increase in copayment, no increase in deductions. The premium is going to remain the same, 31.5 percent. Taxpayers are going to continue to pay 68.5 percent unless you are the most affluent.

I have the most affluent in my community. Yes, they are going to have to pay more. If they are married, after \$150,000, they pay all of Medicare part B. If they are single, after \$100,000, they pay all of Medicare part B. For the most affluent, people want to talk about how we want to help the wealthy, we are saying the wealthy should pay for more for Medicare to help save the trust fund.

Do we force people to get off private care? No. They can stay there. If they want to go into private care, they can do that. Why would they want to do that? Because they can maybe get bet-

ter eye care for the same cost, might get dental care, might get a reduction or rebate in their premium. They might not have to pay that copayment or a deductible with some private care plans. So they can do that. Nobody makes them. If they decide to go into private care under our Medicare-plus plan and they do not like it, they can come back.

For 2 years every month they can go in and come out. They do not have to wait a year. Only in the third year would they have to stay in the plan.

When I hear people say we are cutting, I think, yes, we are cutting some programs. We are not cutting Medicare. We are not cutting Medicaid. They continue to go up. We are slowing the growth of those programs. We are changing them. We are allowing people to have other opportunities.

I hope eventually the rich-and-poor dialog just falls by the wayside because it is simply a sham. We have the biggest cut in our tax program is two-thirds of our cut is \$500 tax credit per family. You mean to tell me if you have a kid under 18 and those who might be listening to this right now, you ask yourself if you are wealthy, if you have a child under 18, you are going to get a \$500 tax credit; you are going to get one; and if you are wealthy, then we fit the description. But if you happen to be like most Americans, 75 percent of whom make less than \$75,000, they are going to get that \$500 tax credit.

The earned income tax credit is being eliminated? No. We are saying it is not going to increase above \$28,000. If you are at \$28,000 and you and your husband are working and you only make \$28,000 or just one is working and you have 4 kids, you pay no Federal taxes. You get actually a rebate. You are paid by the Federal Government, no tax; you are paid. We are just saying we cannot increase that to \$35,000. We are also saying that if it applies to a senior, you know, Social Security should count as an income.

So I listened to the rhetoric and some of it has some truth to it, some of it, but some of it is just so off base.

I am just proud to be part of this Republican majority that has the courage and the determination to get our financial house in order.

#### REPEAL OF THE NURSING HOME PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the 5-minutes this evening for over an hour now, about an hour and a half, and I think one thing that anyone who has been watching or been listening can conclude is that neither side of this aisle has a monopoly on wisdom, and there really is both wisdom and ignorance on both sides of the aisle.



I think that when you look at this bill that we are going to vote on tomorrow, there are things that I can support and that I do support in this bill, but there are some things that truly will cause unneeded suffering for Americans and really things that are just out of place when you look at the facts.

Yesterday evening I talked about one of them. I talked about the Medicare program, the fact that the \$270 billion in cuts has nothing to do with what the actuaries say. The 7-year actuarial life, in 12 of the 30 years it has had a shorter actuarial life.

Tonight I want to focus in on something that has no place in that bill, and that is, it is not in a couple of thousand page bill, it is really probably just a page and a half, and that is repealing the 1987 Nursing Home Protection Act. That is one of the many things this bill does that really is unprecedented and really, truly tragic.

Prior to 1987, I think there are many people who are listening and watching remember reading and seeing stories, really horrible stories, stories about nursing home patients being tied down in nursing homes, being in their own feces, in their own urine, being drugged so they would not move, nursing home residents really dying in nursing home facilities because of lack of fire exits, nursing home facilities that had no 24-hour staff, I mean, horror stories on, if not a weekly basis, definitely on a monthly basis throughout the country.

There is a reason we do not hear those horrors today, because in 1987 this Congress passed a law providing nursing home residents, the weakest of the weak, the most vulnerable of the most vulnerable in our society, protection against things like being tied down, like being drugged, like making sure that there was 24-hour nursing facility and a trained person in that facility, three meals a day, fire exits. You know, if that is overregulation, then I am for overregulation.

But I do not think most Americans think that that is overregulation. I think most Americans think that that is sound public policy that really is in the public interest.

Let me just go on in terms of what this regulation prevents from happening. I served in the State legislature for 10 years, from 1982 to 1992. Prior to that I served as a director of a Medicare advocacy group, 1982 and 1981. During that period, about once a week I would get a call from either the spouse or the child of someone who was being evicted from a nursing home, and I will tell you, I remember as if it were today, those phone calls because I have never heard since really just the tragedy. You can imagine what it means, someone's spouse, their parent is being evicted from a nursing home, and they called me and they asked me to do something. My response had to be there was nothing I could do, because the law did not protect those people either in Florida or in the United States.

That does not exist today. People cannot be evicted from nursing homes in the United States of America today. No one gets those calls in the United States of America today.

The tragedy that happened to thousands, tens of thousands of families in this country, does not happen, and in fact, the facts are that there was just lots of empirical evidence that was pointed out in hearings for this legislation in the 1980's that people died when evicted from nursing homes. That does not happen today, because of a piece of legislation that is going to be repealed tomorrow by that bill, and it should not be.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I propose this as an amendment to the Committee on Rules, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, well, the States can do better; the States know better; we want to return this issue to the States.

You know, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really have selective memory when they think about the States doing better. They pick and choose the issues they think the States can do better on.

Two hundred years of tort law in America, forget that, the Federal Government knows best in the areas of medical malpractice. We are going to obliterate 200 years of States' rights in that area. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, there is one mandate, one State mandate in the Medicaid bill, in this bill. There is one State mandate, and that State mandate is that States cannot choose to spend money for abortions.

□ 2045

It is an amazing concept when you think about that. Mandating that issue, which they prioritize, but they say we cannot mandate, that there cannot be nursing home evictions.

I urge my colleagues tomorrow to really defeat this legislation for this and other reasons, and hopefully that people who are listening and watching will call their Members to let them know this is a provision in this bill that they do not want to see enacted.

#### CONGRESS' MARCHING ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I am excited tonight to talk about what is truly a historic day that is going to occur tomorrow, and I have four of my colleagues here this evening. I have the gentleman from Spokane, Mr. NETHERCUTT, the gentleman from north Washington State, in the second district, Mr. METCALF, and what I call an honorary member of the Washington delegation, my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FOX, and also Mr. WHITE here from Washington State as well.

The reason we are all here tonight to talk and really have a dialog among ourselves, but with the American people, is about what is going to occur tomorrow. It is truly a historic day. It really brings to a close in really a grand finale of what we have said is our motto, "Promises made, promises kept."

That is what we have done. We all ran and campaigned with the Contract With America because we believed it was the right thing to do. When we got here, we started on day one and began implementing the Contract With America, many of those issues we believe that are important. Between now and the time that we conclude, some time in mid-November, the sooner the better, to get the people's work done, there are four main issues we are going to accomplish, and those are embodied in this Reconciliation Act we are going to be working on tomorrow and passing.

The four main issues, and really they are Congress' marching orders, first and foremost, obviously, is to balance the budget within 7 years. The second is saving Medicare from bankruptcy, not for just this generation of seniors but the next. Reforming the welfare system, to get people on self-dependency. Last, but definitely not least, is allowing people to keep more of their hard earned money.

All of us here tonight engaged in this colloquy can bring personal experiences from people we talked to at home about these important issues. The first issue we will talk about is the whole issue of balancing the budget.

I know the gentleman from the second district in Washington State has probably been working on this issue longer than all of us in his elected career. He has done a phenomenal job. I would like to ask the gentleman from the second district of Washington, to tell us a little bit about what you have heard at home, why balancing the budget is important and why you are looking forward to casting an aye vote tomorrow and what this will really mean to working people at home, not just using the overall numbers, but what it will mean to families.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, this is in fact more than just how it will impact the individuals, and it will. We have to solve this problem. I look at it from my point of view basically as more about my grandchildren. What are we leaving for them?

Norma and I have really in a small way realized the American dream. We own our own home, we use our own home for our own small business, and we were able to gain our home and we own it free and clear. I worry about that for my grandchildren. I think that the debt, the huge debt, the payments of \$1,300 per person per year, not taxpayers, \$1,300 per man, woman, children, all over America, I believe that is destroying the American dream for our children and grandchildren. I think

their chance to own a home is 10 percent of the chance that I had to own a home.

I think that this American dream is a thing that I resent most about year after year of overspending, needless, wasteful overspending, by people who voted over and over and over for unbalanced budgets and raising the debt limit. I believe that they are busily destroying the American dream for our children, and we intend to fix that.

Mr. TATE. The point that I have heard at least when I have been home, and the point that really drives it home more than anything, is the first point on why the Republicans are balancing the budget, and it is for our children. My daughter, Madeleine, and I use this number over and over but it drives a point home, in her lifetime she will have to spend \$187,150 in taxes just for her share of the national debt.

Mr. METCALF. Just for her share of paying the interest on the national debt.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is correct, not for defense, not for Social Security, but just her share of the interest. I know the gentleman from Spokane was home this weekend and had a chance to talk to constituents through the Fifth District of Washington. Mr. NETHERCUTT, give us some of your insights of what you have heard and why you believe this issue is so important back home to working people back in Spokane?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for your leadership in trying to meet the goals of this Republican Congress, and that is to balance this Federal budget. That is the overriding concern that I think all of us have as we look at the fiscal responsibility that we exercise here and the fiscal responsibility that the Federal Government needs to exercise.

I spoke with a constituent today who communicated with me after watching the debate on the reconciliation bill today. His name is Rich Kuling. He made a comment to me after watching this debate, he quoted Aristotle, and he said, "It is not ignorance, but false knowledge that is the greatest impediment to human progress."

We are seeing a lot of that today, as we listen to the debate on this issue of reconciliation and the rhetoric of the critics of balancing the Federal budget.

The gentleman is right. I hear from my constituents on a daily basis, several hundred letters a day, just like all Members do in the Washington delegation. They see, "Keep going. Be true to your promises and your commitments that got you elected, and balance this Federal budget, not only for our generation, mine, but for my parents' generation and for my children's generation."

So it is just a simple fact that we need to keep in mind as we look at the debate and the issue-by-issue examination of the reconciliation bill. Is it a perfect bill? Probably not. But certainly the overriding purpose is per-

fect, and that is to balance this Federal budget.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is correct. It is for our children. We have heard about that at home. It will accelerate long-term growth, we know that, by lowering interest rates. It will strengthen financial markets, when the markets know we are actually serious this year about balancing the budget. It is going to raise productivity, when people can keep more of their own money, they can spend more money on their families and business. It will reduce inflation, make products a little more affordable, and strengthen the dollar.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania, though he is 3,000 miles away from Washington State, I know he has heard some of these same kinds of things from his constituents.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been a leader in our freshman class and this 104th Congress in helping us move ahead toward a balanced budget. Whether one is a Republican or Democrat, we have a historic opportunity this week to actually balance the budget and do some things that I think my constituents and your constituents in Washington State want us to achieve for the first time since 1969. That will be to lower housing costs.

If we balance the budget, according to a study by the National Association of Realtors, the average 30-year mortgage will drop by almost 3 percent. Our car expenses, your car loan rates for your constituents and mine, will lower by at least 2 percentage points. That is on a \$15,000 5-year car loan, at about 9.75-percent interest, that is an extra \$900 in the family budget. We will have lower college costs as a result of balancing the budget. Student loan rates will drop at least two points. A college student who borrows \$11,000 will pay \$2,500 less for the car loan, student loan, and even more when it comes to the mortgage. We will also, by lowering interest rates and having a balanced budget, will create 6.1 million in new jobs.

Mr. TATE. If the gentleman would allow me, we are basically paying a deficit tax. We are paying higher interest rates because the budget is not balanced. Higher interest rates on a car, an average car loan, \$180 a year; on a student loan, an extra \$216 a year; on an average mortgage, \$2,162 a year, for a grand total, most people have a car loan, many people out there still paying their college loans, most of us have a home loan, on average, \$2,558 more per year that we are paying in basically a deficit tax, higher payments to a particular financial institution, because interest rates are higher because of the Government borrowing so much money.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact is our State governments have to balance their budgets, county budgets, school districts, townships, towns, boroughs,

they all have to balance their budgets, and so do our families. But the Federal Government, from many years of not balancing the budgets, now has a \$5 trillion debt. As said by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], we are now having to have our children pay \$187,000 over their lifetime just on the interest. That is going to end, or we are not going to have the salvation that this Congress can bring for the economic future for senior citizens, for working families, and for the children who are going to take over the positions of leadership across this United States.

Mr. TATE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. The gentleman has been a real leader as well in the freshman class. I appreciate that.

I know the gentleman from the First District of Washington State has four children, and is very interested in the future of this country. Tell us what you have heard at home and what are the constituents of the First District of Washington saying and why is it important to balance this budget and pass this reconciliation act tomorrow?

Mr. WHITE. I thank my friend. I also congratulate the gentleman for being a leader. I also say that when you really sit down and think about why we have to balance the budget and why we have to make some decisions on our spending priorities, I think the way the gentleman from the second district has put it several times in the past is probably the most telling way to talk about it. Because when he talks about it, he says do we need this program or do we need to spend this money so badly that we should borrow money from our children to pay for it?

Frankly, that is the way we have to approach every single nickel of Federal spending. There is only one way to get our spending under control and I think we have all talked about this at some length, and that is to make sure that every nickel of spending with nothing sacrosanct is on the table, and that we make fair cuts across the board, so all of us are participating in this program and setting the priorities which we should set for the Federal Government.

I think this bill we are going to vote on tomorrow takes a very good step in that direction. It is not perfect, and I think we have heard the people talk to us all day about how there is one particular thing in this bill that just about everybody can find not to like. But the fact is it takes 218 people to get anything done in this Congress, and we are not going to have a much better product than the bill we have before us tomorrow, with all the millions and billions of dollars that it deals with, to actually balance the budget.

From my perspective, I think the Speaker of the House was right this morning when he said to all of us gathered here this morning, "If you are not prepared to vote for this bill, which balances the budget for the first time

in 30 years, why in the world are you here?"

We gave our word to the American people last year when we ran for office that we were going to balance the budget, somehow, some way. We have worked for 10 months on a program to do that. We have had to make a lot of decisions, we have had to set a lot of priorities, and we have probably made a few mistakes.

But the bottom line is we have a product that will balance the budget, and, frankly, I am going to be very proud to support it.

Mr. TATE. Could the gentleman answer a question: When was the last time the budget was balanced?

Mr. WHITE. I believe it was in 1969 was the last time the budget actually balanced, and I think that actually might have been a bit of a fluke. I do not think the budget that was passed that year actually anticipated it to be balanced. It happened to work out that way because of revenue.

Mr. TATE. So only in Congress was the last time the budget was balanced was in 1969 by happenstance or mistake. Only in Congress could that occur.

Mr. WHITE. By dumb luck. We have had a quote from Aristotle. I might mention a quote from Socrates I like to use sometimes, which is that democracy only works as long as the electorate does not figure out that they can continue to vote themselves benefits from the public treasury, because a majority of people, theoretically, once they figure it out, can decide they are going to vote to increase benefits to themselves.

You had to kind of wonder last year whether we had found the Achilles heel of democracy, whether unfortunately the American electorate figured that out and whether democracy was really going to work. Had a majority figured out a way to borrow money into the future? I think what were are seeing in this bill we are going to pass tomorrow is the answer is no. We have decided to make democracy work, exercise some fiscal responsibility, and come up with a balanced budget.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is exactly right. I believe the public has known it all along we are in a time where we need to make tough decisions. We were elected to do that. That is what I heard.

People at home when I am at home, I do not care whether I am at the local grocery store, standing in line at the ATM machine, people come up to me and say, "Randy, just keep going. My biggest fear is you will not go all the way, as opposed to we are going too far." Their biggest concern is they are all for the balanced budget, but are we really going to do it. Tomorrow we are going to do it. They are concerned, are we going to reform welfare? Tomorrow we are going to do it. They are concerned with tax relief. Tomorrow we are going to do it. Are we going to save Medicare? Tomorrow we are going to do it.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is dying to get a word in.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I just wanted to add to this dialog in this sense. As we approach the budget this year, to make it balance, there were two overriding concerns I think all of us had who were freshmen Members of this 104th Congress, and that is one, if the Government is involved with an activity now, could it be better handled by the private sector? If it could not be the private sector, is there another level of government that can give that service better, more efficiently, more effectively, less expensively and more directly to the people. That has been accomplished to some extent in this budget.

But second, and I think just as important, if not more important, we have looked to find ways to consolidate, downsize, privatize, to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse that has been in this budget for many years. By doing that, we are retaining the actual services that we want to get back to people.

We do not want to have \$30 billion of fraud, waste, and abuse in Medicare. We want \$30 billion of that savings to go back for health care for our seniors. That is exactly what we have done. It has not gotten through in the media as much as we wanted it to, the real facts, but, frankly, this group of 104th Members, both sides of the aisle, I think, are dedicated to their seniors, working families, and our children, to make sure that we provide the services, without overtaxing, overspending, and over-regulating.

□ 2100

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is exactly right, Mr. Speaker. When I am home talking to folks, I always hear that the government that is the closest to their home, their government, their city councils, their county councils, their State legislators, whoever, better know their needs. They know where Tacoma is, they know where Everett is, they know where Spokane is, they know where the cities are in your district. They know best what is needed.

The question I always ask is, well, can this program best be done in the private sector? If not, what level of local government can it be done by? The Federal Government should be the last resort, but for the last 60 years it has been the first resort. We have always said, boy, if we just had more money at the Federal level, if we had one new program, but it has not worked. And we do not have to look further than welfare.

The gentleman from Spokane, Mr. NETHERCUTT, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, they have scoured through thousands of Federal programs looking for areas to reduce, putting money into those programs that work, but taking away from those that do not or change them.

I would yield to the gentleman from Spokane.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is a huge, huge Government. As appropriators looked at the breadth and scope of the Federal Government, it was astounding how many programs and agencies within agencies within agencies we fund. I think what the American people have to realize is that it is not the Government's money that funds these programs, it is the taxpayers' money. It is their money, and my money and everybody else who writes a check on April 15th and sends it to Washington and trusts us in the Congress to do what is right with their money.

So we hear discussion about, well, we do not want to give any kind of a tax cut. What those critics are saying, and the party on the other side is saying is, we want to keep all that tax money that the taxpayers send us because we want to spend it, and the Government wants to spend it and not let the American people spend it.

The majority leaders made statements, and all of us have made statements over the past months saying how can the Government decide how best decide to spend our money? Is that not something that we can decide as citizens better than the Federal Government?

That is what we are trying to do is have a recognition, and we need to have a recognition that it is the taxpayers' money that we are dealing with here. And if we feel we do not want to take more of their money, then I think that is to the taxpayers' best interest and we all have to understand that, especially the critics of this balanced budget concept.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right on in his message on that. The point is there are good people working for the Federal Government, and I am not here to bash Federal workers, but they do not know where the cities are in our State. They do not know our children. We know our children. We know what their needs are. We know if they need a vacation or a new pair of Nikes or a little money put away for health care or a little away for higher education. We know best.

That is what this is about, sending programs out to the States to empower people, not to build bureaucracies here along the Potomac that are filled. A person cannot go anywhere without running into a Federal building. They are full of people working here. We need to send that power out to the States and let them make the decisions.

I want to touch on one point. I know there is so much rhetoric from across the aisle about these terrible cuts we are making. I want to point out that over the last 7 years we have spent \$9.5 trillion, if we add up all the spending that has occurred. Over the next 7 years, under our balanced budget plan, we spend \$12.1 trillion. If we did nothing, if we did things just how we have always done, the status quo, and we

would not have a balanced budget and the kind of change we really want to see, we would spend \$13.3 trillion.

So we are slowing the growth by about \$1 trillion. Spending will increase but it will be spending that is directed at people and helping them out and empowering folks back home in our districts.

I can tell my colleagues as we are dealing with this whole issue of changing the way Government works, there is probably no more volatile issue than the whole issue of Medicare. I think we are all aware that it needs to be saved, protected, preserved, and I know the gentleman from the second district of Washington, Mr. METCALF, has a very special interest in the program. I know he is actually on Medicare, but tell us why and start up a dialog on why we need to save and protect Medicare.

Mr. METCALF. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I say and said the other day, I am the only one in the delegation who has a particular interest because not only do I qualify for Medicare, my wife qualifies for Medicare, my brother is on Medicare and three older sisters are. So I am absolutely dedicated to seeing that this program is not damaged, not put in jeopardy, does not go bankrupt, and it is there for those people counting on it. Because there are millions of people across this Nation that are truly counting on it and it has to be there as they need it.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would allow me, I hear the rhetoric from across the aisle that somehow Medicare is being cut. Could we answer that question?

Mr. METCALF. Well, only in the Congress could a 6-percent increase be considered a cut. It is the new math that they learned and it does not work very well.

Mr. TATE. Exactly. I have a chart here to really illustrate. If an individual is on Medicare today, they will receive on average across this country \$4,816 a year. In the year 2002, they will receive \$6,734. Now, like we just said, when we went to school and we received more the next year than we had the last year, that was an increase.

Talk about new math. Maybe it is just verbal grenades that are being thrown from across the aisle trying to scare senior citizens, and that is too bad, but the bottom line is Medicare spending will continue to rise.

I know the gentleman who serves on the Committee on Commerce, Mr. WHITE, I know he has been real active in this debate, really in the cat bird seat as we have been working on it. Tell us a little about what the trustees have said, why this is important and why seniors will actually be better off under this plan than if we just buried our heads like ostriches and ignored the problem.

Mr. WHITE. Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. The Medicare bill came to our committee, and although I did not know a whole lot about it until I got involved on the

committee, I have sure learned a heck of a lot about it in the last 2 or 3 months, and I would say a couple things about it.

First, I hope people understand how significant it is what we are trying to accomplish today. A year ago, when I was running for office, there were lots of people who would tell me it is basically impossible as a political matter to balance the Federal budget. Why? Because nobody will ever dare touch Medicare, nobody will ever dare touch Medicaid, nobody will ever dare touch welfare. Three entitlement programs that basically are the biggest problems we have in the Federal budget.

And everybody knows unless we get those problems under control, we cannot balance the budget. And a year ago people were saying it is politically impossible to do so.

Well, tomorrow, and actually last week when we voted on Medicare, we started to prove those people wrong. I think we did so in a way that when people look at the changes that we have made in the Medicare program, for example, they will be proud, proud as I am, of the sort of solution that we have come up with.

What we have done is basically say if an individual likes the current Medicare system the way it is, they get to keep it. That is end of it. If they like what they have right now, they will keep it. The same percentage basis of premiums, same arrangement with their doctors, same paybacks by the Federal Government. The whole system stays the same. But if they would rather have some of the other choices that most modern health care plans make available to other people in the current health care system, they will have some of those choices, too. And we have five or six choices: Medical savings account, managed care, provider service networks, and several other possibilities that people can choose from.

So, really, by modernizing this program we are able to save some money, provide health care more efficiently, but for people who are not comfortable making that transition or want to keep what they have now, they are entitled to do that.

Mr. TATE. So, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is stating very clearly is that seniors will have more choices next year under this plan than they currently have today.

Mr. WHITE. They will have the same choices everybody out in the economy already has.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, what I like about the plan is, if an individual does not want to change, they can stay on the plan. If they do not fill out the form, they are automatically on your current plan.

The other frustrating thing I have seen, and I think we have all been attacked in some capacity back in our districts, that these are somehow tax cuts for the rich; that somehow we are cutting taxes for the rich and we are

paying for it out of cuts out of Medicare.

If the gentleman would respond. I know the other gentlemen, Mr. FOX and Mr. NETHERCUTT, will want to respond as well.

Mr. WHITE. I will be happy to say a couple of words about that. The fact is this budget does not cut anything, as your charts have shown. It just allows things to increase a little more slowly than they otherwise would have.

We have saved, is the way I like to talk about it, we have saved about \$900 billion, almost \$1 trillion over the 7-year period. And we are going to use that money for lots of different things. We are going to use it to bring down the deficit, so that we get the budget under control. We will use it to provide some fairly small tax cuts to a number of people, primarily people with children, so that they can do a better job of raising their own families. We will use that money for lots of different purposes.

So it is a mistake to say that the Medicare savings are going to go for tax cuts for the rich. In fact, the Medicare bill we passed last week says it is illegal to use those savings to pay for a tax cut. We have to use them to provide for additional benefits to Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. TATE. So the attacks on the other side, as well as those attack ads we have seen at home in some capacity, are just blatantly false.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to say they are, unfortunately, misguided.

Mr. TATE. That might be a nicer way to say the same thing.

Mr. WHITE. A subtler way of saying the same thing.

Mr. TATE. I know the gentleman, Mr. FOX, has had a number of townhall meetings back in his district. The gentleman has a senior advisory committee that helps him on Medicare. If he would tell us what he has heard.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Yes, our Preservation Task Force looked at the problem last April. The President's trustees came out and said in 7 years we will be out of money in this Medicare Program. So what can we do about it? We said, how did we get this problem? Well, health care goes up 4 percent a year, but Medicaid goes up 10 percent a year. What is the problem? We found out there is \$30 billion a year in fraud, waste, and abuse.

This legislation, for the first time, is going to create the Federal offense of health care fraud. If it is violated by a provider, they will not only be out of the Medicare Program as a provider, but they can go to jail for 10 years. This is the first time we have attacked that problem. And under the lockbox, which Congressman WHITE just talked about, the savings we get from getting the fraud and abuse and waste eliminated has to go back to the Medicare Program.

I think it is important to point out, and, Congressman TATE, we appreciate your bringing this issue forward, but we want to separate the myth from the facts. The myth is that it will not be a

better program. The facts are it will be a much better than we have today. Besides the fact we have fee-for-service and other choices for medicaid accounts and managed care, it will not raise Medicare copayments or deductibles, it will not reduce services or benefits for the program, it will not force anyone to join an HMO. They can stay in the fee-for-service that we have now. We will retain the current fee-for-service plan. It will ensure the solvency of the program for the first time.

And as the gentleman stated earlier, it will increase from \$4,800 a year to \$6,700, which is a 40-percent increase, and it will increase the amount of money spent in the program \$659 billion over that spent in the prior 7 years. And with the lockbox and the savings we are going to get from fraud, abuse, and waste elimination, we will make sure that Medicare is strong for this generation of seniors and the ones that follow.

Mr. TATE. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is all about. The gentleman has hit it on the nose. Medicare is going broke. The trustees said it is. The Clinton-appointed trustees. We are going to save, protect, and preserve it. Seniors are going to get more money next year and the year after and the year after, and every single year, and they will have more choices and less waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman would yield, there is one other great thing about this program that we overlook sometimes. We should focus on what is going to happen to beneficiaries, but this program will have some real big benefits for our medical care system as a whole.

Right now the Government, under the Medicare Program, writes the checks for 30 percent of all the health care in the United States. The Medicaid Program is another 20 percent. So between those two programs, we, right now, are buying half of the medical care that Americans get in the United States.

We have been saying for the last 40 years that we think it is going to go up about 15 percent next year, and so that is why we have to raise the budget every year. It is about time for the Federal Government to exercise a little fiscal restraint. It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. If someone is selling something to someone and they tell them that they think they will have to pay 10 percent more for it next year, we can be sure they are going to have to pay 10 percent more because they are going to charge them 10 percent more. That is what the Federal Government has been doing.

So one of the things we do under this plan is to say we will not continue those old ways. We are going to try to exercise some restraint, maybe save a little money, and we are going to say it should rise at about 6.5 percent next year. I think that is a real step in the right direction.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I would now yield to the gentleman from Spokane.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I was going to say this is a 30-year-old system. This was begun about 30 years ago, and Congressman WHITE made mention of it a moment ago. This is a courageous step. Without being too self-serving here, this is a courageous step to tackle this monster program and try to get our arms around it and fix it, because it is broken.

When the private sector is only growing at about 4 percent a year, and have reduced actually a little over 1 percent last year, but yet the Federal system grows at 10½ percent a year, it is not working. And I think we in the Congress, this reformed Congress have stood up and said this can be a better system, and that is what we do have is a better Medicare system. It will give my mom and your parents and Jack and his family a greater range of choices. What is wrong with that? That is a good system, a good system change.

□ 2115

As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] says, senior citizens who want to stay on the existing system can do so. And that should give everybody in this country of senior citizen age a great satisfaction, that they can either keep what they have, or get something better. We think it is a better Medicare system.

One other quick point. In 1993, President Clinton made mention about his tax increases, that they were too much. They affected directly the senior citizen population that the critics of Medicare reform and preservation are arguing so hard to protect.

Mr. Clinton raised, and the Democrat Congress increased the tax rate from 50 percent to 85 percent on Social Security benefits for individuals with incomes in excess of \$34,000 and couples in excess of \$44,000. This reconciliation bill repeals that tax increase.

So, I do not agree with anybody who says that we are not trying to protect senior citizens in this tax bill, not only through Medicare reform and preservation, but through the repeal of the Clinton and Democrat Congress tax increases.

Mr. TATE. If my colleagues listen to the administration, someone who makes \$34,000 a year or \$40,000 a year would be under the title of rich. I know in my town hall meetings, the issue comes up about the tax cuts and I ask everyone in the room that makes under \$200,000 a year, that has kids under 18, to raise their hand, and I tell them to keep their hand up. I say, you are looking at the rich. These are the people that are rich.

We are trying to give more money back to working people and senior citizens. They are the people that helped us get through World War II and were the backbone of this country through some of the darkest times, the Depression. We should let them keep more of

their money. They worked for it, they pay for it, they should keep it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from the First District of Washington [Mr. WHITE] has some comments on that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that those comments reminded me of a great political cartoon some may remember from last year. There was a poor, old farmer going out to the rural route on the road to open his mailbox and see what he has got in his mail today. He is there with his wife and he is opening the rickety mailbox. He is on a small farm and proud of himself, but he is obviously struggling. He takes out of the mailbox an envelope that is marked "Clinton Tax Increase," and his comment is, "Oh, no, we're rich."

That is about the way some people are approaching this; everybody is rich if they have got some money to be taxed.

Mr. TATE. The statement has always been, "There are two certainties in life, death and taxes, but death does not get worse every single year." That is the point. The taxes keep going up and there is less and less income at the end of the month.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I just wanted to add to this dialogue that you are having about the overall approach. Not only are we trying to make sure we balance the budget for all the reasons that you stated earlier, Congressman TATE, to help our families, to help our jobs, to reduce mortgage costs and reduce college costs, but in addition the tax reform proposal that the majority party have presented will not only help seniors as far as preserving Medicare, but we are going to make sure that we roll back that unfair 1993 tax on Social Security. As well, over the next 5 years, we are going to raise the amount of money that seniors under 70 can earn from \$11,280 to over \$30,000 in the next 5 years, without having deduction from the Social Security.

This is going to keep seniors independent to the extent to be able to do what they want to do with their lives. While many of them are volunteers, some of them want to continue working, and we should not have a disincentive with our Social Security system not allowing them to make up to \$30,000 a year.

Our proposals that have been adopted by the House, if adopted by the Senate as well and signed into law by President, are two more ways that we are going to try to help seniors.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is right. I know the gentleman from Spokane is very interested in providing more money for working families. We talked earlier about the issue of a tax credit for those who want to adopt. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, in my former life as a lawyer in Spokane, WA, 10 months ago, I did probably 100

adoptions a year. It is the greatest service that anybody can provide in our society for another human being, that is to adopt a child and give that child love and care and attention for his or her lifetime.

This bill, this reconciliation bill that is coming in before us tomorrow, which we will pass, provides a tax credit as an incentive for people to ease the burden of adopting a child. Sometimes hard-to-place children, children with health problems and others are difficult to place in a home with the ability to provide the resources necessary to raise that child.

And make no mistake about it, it does cost more money to raise children than to not raise children. That is why we are providing some tax relief to families with children. Along with that, we provide assistance to people to encourage adoption and encourage security for young people in this country for their future life in a loving family.

That is admirable in this tax bill and this reconciliation package that we are putting together. This is a good thing for families. It is a good thing for children. So do not let anyone tell us that we are not sensitive about the children of this country. We are, and we will be as we pass this bill tomorrow.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is correct. That is why we are providing the tax relief for families, the \$500 tax relief. I know the gentleman from the First District is real interested and I know his constituents have talked to him about that issue, I am sure.

Mr. WHITE. They absolutely have, and I wanted to make a comment to my friend from Spokane. The gentleman mentioned that he was a lawyer and the fact is, I try not to emphasize it too much, but I was a lawyer too about 10 months ago. Unlike my friend, I was a bankruptcy lawyer.

As I told people when I was running for Congress last year, frankly, that is pretty darn good training for coming to Congress. Over my legal career, I probably dealt with 100 or 200 companies that had financial problems and I had to figure out how to solve their problems, how to cut their budgets, how to get them to live within their means and find out what programs were working and what programs were not working.

If there is any institution in the world that is a financially troubled institution, it is this Congress. I have frankly found that that has been pretty good experience to come to this body and find out: What programs do we need to have? We are not going to shut down the whole Federal Government. There are some things that the Federal Government needs to do. But there are also some things that are lower on the priority list.

Mr. Speaker, I always say, and what we have done in the reconciliation bill tomorrow is to say: What should the Federal Government do? Let us make sure we do those things well. Let us not do everything in a mediocre way. Fig-

ure out what we should do and do those things well.

But the things that we should not do, things for example that maybe the Commerce Department was doing, or in my view some of the education programs, which I think are better done at the State level, things that really can be better done by people in their families or by State and local governments, let us not do those at the Federal level. Let us not do those at the Federal level, and concentrate on what we should be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think this budget is a good first step in that direction. It does not take us all the way there. We have plenty of work to do, but I do think it does take us part of the way down the road.

Mr. TATE. The message I heard at home from people was that they elected us because they did not want more of the same, but they did not also just want less of the same. They wanted things to be done differently than it has been done for the last 40 years, and definitely since 1969, when the budget was last balanced.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Spokane to talk to us a little bit more about what the tax cuts really entail. The capital gains tax cut, the family tax cut, what will that mean to folks at home?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. It is going to mean more money in their pockets and a better economy for this country, especially for eastern Washington.

Mr. TATE. So it is not just for the rich?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Certainly not. It deals with agriculture too. Agriculture is a very important part of my district in the eastern part of the State of Washington. It is going to help farmers and storekeepers and small businesspeople. It is going to help single moms and single dads raise children, recognizing that that is the most important thing we can do in this country, is raise a good child to be a good citizen.

We are encouraging that as we devolve this, transfer this Federal authority to State authority and local and county authority. That is all in the best interest of local citizens; people in Spokane and Walla Walla and Colville and Colfax and every other city in my district.

It affects the broad range of people in this country; not only by a balanced budget, but by the tax relief we are trying to provide to people and leave more money in their pockets so they can spend it as they deem appropriate.

Mr. TATE. I hear quite often, "Tax cuts for the rich. Oh, it's tax cuts for the rich." We are really talking about working people. The capital gains tax cut, who does that help? Small business owners. Someone who owns a family farm, they sell their house. It affects all of us. The people we know next door or people we work with or people at church. It is just everyday folks.

I know that Mr. METCALF would like to make a few comments on this as well.

Mr. METCALF. My comments are related more back to the children, and that is something that I would just like to comment briefly on, as far as this irresponsible spending over decades. That is what has racked up this \$5 trillion debt. But in actual fact, it is worse than that.

There is \$5 trillion national debt, over \$3 trillion of unfunded liability for pensions and retired military Federal employees, hundreds of billions that we have borrowed from the Social Security funds. It is far more serious than just the deficit. We have to solve them all and we do not have a lot of years. That is why our start now, and the vote we will take tomorrow, is one of the major steps along the way.

I worry more. There was a previous speaker that said, "The most important three things, the three most important responsibilities are our children, our children and our children." What we have done, what we have allowed as people to have happen is to extend this huge debt, load this huge debt on the backs of our children. As I mentioned before, we are destroying the American dream for our children.

It is more than that, even. The continued inability of Congress to balance the budget has become a national disgrace that threatens to permanently destroy public trust in our government. More than that, more than just public trust, if we cannot stop it, it will destroy the government itself.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to borrow more money. I just want to harp on this a little bit more and sort of close with this. What we are doing is selling our children into debt slavery. This is something we have got to consider. The \$187,000 that a child born in 1995 will pay in interest on the debt would buy a pretty respectable house for \$187,000.

That is what has been taken from them, probably, by the previous Congresses that have racked this huge debt that takes these terrible interest payments.

When it comes to interest, I guess I will close on this by saying the people of England are still paying interest on the money that they borrowed to fight Napoleon. They paid that money over 13 times as much as they borrowed, but they still owe it. That is the kind of debt slavery we are promising for our children, instead of the American dream, if we do not fix it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of a Congress that plans to fix it, because we owe this to the future.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is exactly right and I appreciate the gentleman coming out.

Mr. Speaker, there is one last issue that I want to talk about in closing and then we will wrap up for the evening. It is the whole issue of welfare reform. It is an issue I have been involved in in trying to reform at the

State level. It is really, to me, not about balancing the budget. We can talk about the \$5 trillion we have spent since the 1960's on welfare programs. We spend somewhere around \$300 billion a year, if we add up all the programs that are really related to welfare, whether it be health care, direct payments, or AFDC.

That is three times what it would take just to pay people to get above the poverty level, if we could give direct payments. What we have done in the process by these programs, to me it is worse than anything we could do to people. It takes away their self-esteem. It takes away their dignity and destroys families and promotes illegitimacy and irresponsibility, because once they get on the system, they are punished. If they get a job, we cut them off. If they have more children, we give them more money.

It has been said as long as I can remember, we tax more of what we want less of; we subsidize what we want more of. We have subsidized a system that really breeds dependence.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are several provisions in this particular bill. We all have our interests: Time limits; work requirements, and so forth; sending it back to the States. I know our State in the legislature this year, there was a comprehensive bill that passed the State House. It did not pass the Senate. We should turn it back to the States.

I know the gentleman from the First District would like to comment on that as well. I know the gentleman is interested in welfare reform.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in welfare reform and I agree with my good friend's comment that this has really very little to do with balancing the budget. Sure, we want to make this program as efficient as possible. But the fact is we have spent \$5 trillion on this program since 1965 and the problems we are trying to solve are a little bit worse than they were in 1965.

If we assume there are 50 million people in poverty in the United States, that is 20 percent of the population. That is probably far too much. The fact is, if we have spent \$5 trillion on 50 million, that is about a million per person over this 20-year period. Frankly, if we gave these people a million dollars, that would probably do more to get them out of poverty than anything else we could do.

So, really, this is not about the budget; it is a moral imperative. At some point, we can try things for a long period of time and then we have to admit that, by golly, it has not worked. And if it has not worked, then we need to try something else.

That is what we are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. TATE. Exactly. The gentleman from Spokane?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Even here in the State of Virginia and I think in New Jersey there is an experiment of giving

the States the ability to experiment with welfare reform and have more flexibility from the Federal system.

In those two States I mentioned, they have had people who have been on welfare and also have had an incentive to work while continuing to receive some welfare benefits. That is work. They are now filling out tax returns and actually getting into the habit of working, instead of just receiving welfare money or welfare assistance and having a disincentive to work.

□ 2130

I think our plan is very clearly designed to provide an incentive for people to ease themselves off welfare. Two years will be an ample time.

While America, I believe all of us would agree, needs to take care of people who need our help, we do not need to take care of people who just want our help. That is what this bill is intended to do, is to create incentives for people to be off the system and to make our entire national system of free enterprise and capitalism work better, and it will.

Mr. TATE. The gentleman is right. I could not have said it better myself, even if I had attempted to. The point is well taken. There is no better feeling. It is a human feeling, that you are doing something, that you are getting up and going to work, getting up and contributing to society. We need to do everything we can to encourage them to go out there and work.

Doggone it, a 2- or 3-year time limit, there has got to be an end. Eventually you have got to say, if you are able-bodied, maybe I should get out there and get a job, give a little something back. That is what this welfare reform is all about.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been an active participant in this particular issue.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think it is very clear.

First, I appreciate your bringing this dialog forward because, without having welfare reform, we are not going to attack one of the biggest issues in the country; and Republicans and Democrats alike, as well as the Congress and the President, know that this welfare system is not working. Everybody has said so.

What are we going to do about it? The President recommended in the food program and WIC that we have a 3.1-percent increase. The other side of the aisle said 3.6. We adopted a 4.5-percent Republican majority position for an increase in those food programs. But, more importantly, we said we are going to block grant those programs to the States but with a 15-percent administrative cost we used to spend in administering at the Federal level. We said to the Governors, you can only spend 5 percent. But with the additional 10 percent we are giving you, you must feed more children more meals.

Going back to the States, back to the individual local levels, we are going to

give them more money, going right to services. That is what the welfare reform bill is all about. The fact is there are able-bodied people who will be given the opportunity under this legislation to have job training, job placement, job counseling, and day care, if necessary.

So those are very important points. It is a compassionate bill that gets service to those who need it, but those that do not deserve to be on welfare and are not really qualifying should be removed from those rolls.

Mr. TATE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] is here. I appreciate you taking the time to come out this evening.

Mr. WELLER. I welcome the opportunity to join with you. I see my colleagues here from Washington State and Pennsylvania. Of course, I come from the heartland, the State of Illinois, the land of Lincoln. Let me tell you, I have heard so much frustration coming from the taxpayers that I represent regarding our welfare system.

Today, we have a welfare system in which, over the last 30 years, the taxpayers have invested \$5 trillion. That is T, as in trillion dollars. What have we gotten as a result? Higher rates of juvenile crime, more children living in poverty today than ever before and higher rates of teenage illegitimacy. That is the result of our current welfare state.

It has failed. We have got to change it. Like you, I am committed to changing our welfare system. I am proud to say that our welfare plan that passed the House this year emphasizes family and responsibility and emphasizes work and goes after those deadbeat parents that are not meeting their obligation to their own flesh and blood, their own children. I am proud to say that we passed a good welfare reform.

But, at the same time, if we are going to say, okay, folks, it is time to get off welfare, it is time to go to work, we have to make sure that there are jobs there for them to go to work at.

Under our program, our balanced budget, there are so many benefits for people who want to work. In the last few days, I have met with building tradesmen, members of a local labor union in my district, with the African-American leadership in my district, with the farmers, the small businesspeople and the students; and they all say, jobs are important. If we are going to move people off welfare and put them to work, we have got to make sure there are jobs there for them.

It was interesting, there has been some what you would call independent statistics that really show why our economic plan is so important and why it is so important to balance the budget. These are not plans that come from the Democrats or the Republicans or information that comes from the Office of Management and Budget appointed



by the President so it has got political leanings. You understand that. They say, if we balance the budget, we will lower taxes, lower interest rates and also have a stronger economy as a result.

McGraw Hill, a respected think tank, an independent organization, released a study that they did for the National Association of Realtors which concluded that a balanced budget would result in a 2.7 percent drop in mortgage interest rates. What that means for a family in Illinois, in my home State, is that a family with a 30-year \$50,000 mortgage at just a little over 8 percent interest would save \$32,000 over the life of the loan. That is over \$1,000 annually. That is an even bigger tax cut just by lowering interest rates.

A college student, student loans, giving young people the opportunity to go to school, a college student borrowing \$11,000 at 8 percent interest, a lower rate than they currently would get at their local bank or through the direct lending program, would save \$2,100 over the life of the loan.

Lower taxes, lower interest rates will create a stronger economy and create jobs.

In fact, the Joint Economic Committee estimates that by lowering interest rates, brought about by a balanced budget because the Federal Government is no longer competing with our small businesses, those who want to go to school or our local families by lowering interest rates over 2 percent it would create 6.1 million new jobs over the next 10 years just because interest rates are lower.

That is the best kind of tax cut. Lower interest rates, lower taxes, better-paying jobs. That is why I stand in support of balancing the budget for the first time in 26 long years, and I am proud to say I will be casting a vote tomorrow to balance the budget and live within our means just like every American family.

Mr. TATE. I thank the gentleman. I know the hour is late. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] would like to make some closing remarks as we finish up our evening colloquy.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I just want to say as new Members of Congress, all of us have cast some very serious votes in this 104th Congress. It is a historic Congress. Tomorrow's vote probably will be bigger than any of the votes we will have made thus far, the last of which was on our Medicare vote.

This is an important vote. It means the future of the country for the next 7 years. It means we will balance the Federal budget in 7 years and this is the starting point as we go each year and meet our financial obligations for the country.

I think this is a proud moment for all of us as freshmen. It is a difficult moment as we all have said. This is not a perfect bill, but it has got so much good in it and so little bad, I think as you really balance it out. But I think

we have no choice but to vote for the future of the country and vote in favor of this reconciliation bill.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this and certainly the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] for all the work we have done as freshmen. I know there is a lot more work to do, but we will meet the task.

Mr. TATE. A few closing remarks by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] as your reflect on tomorrow's vote.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot resist the opportunity to make a few closing remarks.

No. 1, I would like to thank the gentleman for putting together this program allowing us to have this time. I would like to tell you and the other Members that have spoken tonight how proud I am to be a part of this class. We are all freshmen, all kind of learning our job, but frankly I think by and large we make good decisions and I think we are committed to doing what needs to be done.

Finally, I would like to say we are going to take an important vote tomorrow. I think we will vote to balance the budget, but let us not forget, that that is really only the beginning of our job. Because every day for the next 7 years after this bill tomorrow, we are going to have the opportunity to bust the budget again. This is not an amendment to the Constitution and every day Congress can undo what it did the day before.

So tomorrow is very important. It is essential that we take this vote and I know that we will but let us not forget the long term. Because we are going to have to keep the faith, keep our fiscal restraint, keep the discipline every day for 7 years if we are actually going to get this job done. I am committed to that, I think a majority of the Members of the House are committed to it. I just look forward to getting through that process and actually getting to a balanced budget in the year 2002.

Mr. TATE. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE]. This bill will be binding by our vigilance and how hard we work on it. I thank you for your courage and involvement in this as a leader in the freshman class.

A few last comments by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] as we close out this evening, before our vote tomorrow.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I just want to say I appreciate, as the others do, that you have taken a central role here in the 104th Congress in bringing forth I think the vision that you had in Washington State here to Washington, DC. That is, to get our fiscal house in order, to be accountable to people back home, and to also make sure that the services that the people truly need from their Federal Government, they will get. But they will get them with-

out the waste, without the fraud, without the abuse, without overregulating, without overspending. We can make a difference by working with both sides of the aisle, working with the President and in the end I think we are going to have a bill that starts with tomorrow's vote but will end sometime before the holidays, which I think will bring about a bipartisan effort which will be better for all of America.

I appreciate the fact that I know you will be at the table there making sure that your vision and that which the 104th Congress has to make the country stronger, fiscally more responsible will in fact be the reality.

Mr. TATE. I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] for taking the time to come out tonight. The fact remains seniors next year will have more Medicare than they had this year. Welfare recipients are going to get back to work. There are going to be more college loans next year than there were this year. And school lunches are still going to be there. All this kind of Chicken Little, the sky is going to fall, the threats of fiscal Armageddon if these things do not pass, we have been blamed for everything but the war in Bosnia. The bottom line is we are interested in making sure our kids have a brighter future. It is about providing more jobs. It has been mentioned several times in different ways, we want to lower interest rates, not just because it feels good and it is a great accounting thing. It affects people's real lives. It provides more jobs, more opportunities and that is what it is all about, the things that we are going to cover tomorrow.

We are going to balance the budget for the first time in 7 years, we are going to save Medicare not only for seniors on it today but for our children tomorrow. We are going to reform welfare, to give people dignity again, to get them off the system that really abuses them and to provide tax relief not only for families but for economic opportunities, allow people to spend more of their money. That is what it is all about. It is about opportunity. The question really tomorrow is do we borrow or do we balance? Opportunity or fear? That is what it is all about. This Congress is going to balance. We are no longer going to continue the ways of just borrowing ourselves into oblivion. I thank the gentlemen for taking the time. I look forward to casting this historic vote tomorrow.

#### FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTINGS A DANGER TO MORUROA ATOLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from American Samoa

[Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to share with my colleagues and the American people a very serious problem with France's resumption of nuclear testing in the South Pacific, which started last month despite near universal condemnation by the Nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the first Sunday of this month France detonated a 110-kiloton nuclear device more destructive than seven Hiroshima bombs that were dropped in Japan about 50 years ago. It was the second in a series of nuclear explosions to take place in France's test facilities in French Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, over three decades, France has detonated in excess of 200 nuclear bombs, almost all of them taking place in the South Pacific. Yet this is still not enough to satisfy France's ambitions to become a nuclear power.

French President Chirac boldly claims that their nuclear tests have no ecological consequences and that they have nothing to fear nor to hide. President Chirac has even invited scientists from the international community to come to their testing facilities to see for themselves.

When the countries of Europe recently took Chirac up on his offer for an "open door" inspection, however, it is interesting to note the results of this so-called open door policy.

The European Union team of scientists sent to examine Mururoa Atoll has now returned to Brussels, stating that they were denied full access to test sites and radioactivity monitoring facilities. Moreover, the French authorities failed to supply necessary health and safety data requested by the European Union scientists.

Not surprisingly, the European Union team has not been able to issue conclusive findings regarding France's testing program, as they were prevented by the French government from conducting a true study.

□ 2145

While the French Government claims they have nothing to hide and welcome international scrutiny of their nuclear testing program, Mr. Speaker, President Chirac's actions reveal nothing more than sheer hypocrisy not only to the good citizens of France, but to the world as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would also note that Reuters News Agency last week reported from Brussels that a French scientist states that France's South Pacific weapons test site is unstable. There is a risk of landslides and tidal waves which could submerge islands in French Polynesia. Dr. Pierre Vincent, a volcanologist and professor at the University of Clermont-Ferrand, testified at a European Parliament hearing on France's South Pacific nuclear testing, and he said this is an unstable atoll. He was referring to the Mururoa atoll, Mr. Speaker. I would say this situation constitutes a high risk.

All the factors which we know now favor destabilization in volcanoes are gathered together at Mururoa, Dr. Vincent testified, pointing to the atoll's steep sides, fissuring in the atoll and alterations of substructure by previous tests.

Dr. Vincent further states the shock wave from a new explosion could be the trigger that would cause detachment of previously disturbed sections of rock. He said such landslides could cause tsunamis, which means tidal waves, seismic waves from undersea earthquakes or landslides which could submerge the whole of certain islands of Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Vincent concluded it was high time to stop the nuclear testing program France is conducting now in the Pacific, but even an immediate halt to France's current series of tests in the region would not remove the risk. He said if we stop tomorrow, if that could happen, we could certainly have to continue to monitor this atoll for decades and probably a lot longer than that.

Mr. Speaker, France's resumed nuclear tests on Mururoa and Fangataufa atolls, which are actually dormant volcanic formations below sea level, has also initiated an investigation by the European Parliament and the New Zealand Government into possible connections with the recent eruptions of New Zealand's Mt. Ruapehu, a volcano dormant for the past 50 years.

Internationally Mr. Speaker, the movement against France's nuclear testing in the South Pacific is growing stronger and stronger. Over 100 nations adopted in Vienna an international Atomic Energy Agency resolution condemning nuclear testing. The United Nations General Assembly in New York is soon to pass a resolution opposing all nuclear testing, while in London the British Commonwealth is pressuring France about its insensitivity in conducting nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope all of our colleagues in the Congress would join us in sending an urgent message to Paris to stop their nuclear nightmare in the Pacific. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues, this is what a French nuclear bomb explosion looks like on this atoll, the Mururoa atoll in French Polynesia. I have also made an illustration of exactly what the concerns have been for the nations of the Pacific for all of these years and for many scientists.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this is the Mururoa atoll from the vertical as seen from an airplane. This is what the atoll looks like, and by the way, this illustration was gotten from documents of the French Government showing areas that were completely contaminated in the aftermath of the French nuclear program and the testing for the past 20 years.

This is the profile of what the Mururoa atoll, which is this green strip, which is right on sea level;

Mururoa atoll is only about 3 feet above sea level, and below this whole atoll is this volcanic formation. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, these dots, these red dots are 165 atomic explosions that have taken place on that atoll for the last 20 years.

In addition to this, France has also exploded 12 nuclear bombs above sea level, which is basically in the atmosphere. I submit, Mr. Speaker, who is going to clean up this mess if this atoll ever, ever should leak, come out of this, because of what has happened inside this atoll?

Now some people might say, well, let us not be concerned about it, because it is thousands of miles away from the State of Hawaii as well as along the Pacific Coast States. Mr. Speaker, I submit if this atoll ever breaks or starts to leak and all the nuclear contamination that is contained here after France conducting 165 nuclear explosions inside this volcanic formation that supports this atoll, I submit, Mr. Speaker, who is going to clean up this mess?

I submit also that France does not have the capability to clean up this mess if it ever does come to this within the next 10, perhaps even 50 years that this will transpire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad occasion, given the fact that over 60 percent of the French people themselves do not want France or President Chirac to conduct this nuclear testing nightmare, as we see it, in the Pacific. And yet the French Government persists that they do this in the name of its national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned in the fact that President Chirac does not take into account the fact that 28 million men, women, and children, live in this Pacific region, let alone there are some 200,000 French citizens who are of Tahitian ancestry that live also in these islands, and yet we hear nothing but absolute stubbornness, and I would also submit, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could even say arrogance on the part of the French Government, not the goodness of the French people, but the French Government to continue doing this despite the condemnation of over 160 countries throughout the world.

Why are we doing this?

Is it not ironic, Mr. Speaker, that while we condemn germ warfare, while we outlaw chemical and biological warfare, we continue to allow not only industrial countries but the fact that we have got nuclear bombs all over the place that cause just as much, if not more, harm and damage not only to the environment but to human beings, and yet we continue to allow this.

I stated earlier that the nuclear bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima 50 years ago, Mr. Speaker, killed, maimed approximately 200,000 men, women, and children. In addition to that, 90,000 men, women, and children were also killed with the bomb that we dropped on Nagasaki. In the aftermath of this, and I would make a personal

appeal to the American people, we have got to send a strong message to President Chirac and the only way to do this, perhaps not necessarily through governmental channels, but the conscience of the American people and the conscience of the people in Japan and even in Germany to voluntarily not purchase French products, French wine, French goods, to send a strong message to the French Government that this policy of continuing to explode nuclear bombs in the South Pacific, not only is it insane but it is an outright shame for the Government of France to continue to do this in the aftermath, at least at the expense of the health and safety and the lives of those people who live in that part of the world.

The information referred to follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Oct. 11, 1995]

**FRENCH PAPER RUNS A PHOTO OF MURUROA CORAL CRACKS**

PARIS.—Raising new questions about the safety of French nuclear tests, a newspaper published photographs today that it says show cracks in one of the South Pacific atolls where the underground explosions took place.

Ouest-France said the photographs contradict government claims that the tests caused no damage to Mururoa Atoll in French Polynesia.

Critics say the nuclear tests could cause the atoll to break apart, spewing radioactivity into the water and air in what many consider to be one of the world's last paradises.

The government denied a similar report last week in the respected daily *Le Monde*. It had no immediate comment on Ouest-France's claims.

Ouest-France said the photos were taken in 1987 and 1988 by a diver several dozen yards under the Mururoa Lagoon.

The cracks are about 9 to 10½ feet wide and several miles long, the newspaper said.

Normally only military personnel and scientists working on the French nuclear program have access to the isolated atoll, about 750 miles southeast of Tahiti.

After the *Le Monde* report, French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette told the National Assembly that "no crack of any sort has ever been discovered" on the atoll.

Experts at the French Atomic Energy Commission said some fractures were created by the first tests carried out directly under Mururoa's reef.

But they said there had been no further cracks since tests were moved to the middle of the lagoon.

European Commission President Jacques Santer demanded Wednesday that France supply more information about the nuclear tests "without delay."

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Oct. 5, 1995]

**FRENCH DENY REPORT THAT N-TEST SITE FULL OF CRACKS**

PARIS.—A report that a South Pacific island used for France's nuclear tests is full of cracks put the government back on the defensive yesterday over its underground testing program.

The Defense Ministry dismissed the report as "trivial and whimsical," and said it has the situation at Mururoa Atoll under "perfect scientific and ecological control."

The Paris newspaper *Le Monde* reported Tuesday that a 1980 French army map shows that years of nuclear pounding had cracked the atoll, site of a 20-kiloton nuclear test blast on Sept. 5.

Some scientists have warned that the atoll could break open under the force of continued test blasts or a natural disaster, releasing radioactivity and poisoning an area known for its coral reefs and crystal waters.

Gen. Raymond Germanos denied the newspaper report and accused the environmental group Greenpeace of twisting decade-old unofficial data about the atoll. He said the newspaper's map misplaced key features of the island and the test facility.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Oct. 9, 1995]

**SUSPICION CLOUDS FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS**  
(By Gary T. Kubota)

PAPEETE, TAHITI.—Three of his babies were stillborn.

An infant son lived for a year before dying of leukemia.

His 1-year-old daughter died from a painful disease that blackened her skin.

Edwin Haoa, 57, believes his five children died from illnesses related to a change in his body that produced defective sperm, a result of radioactive contamination while he worked at nuclear testing sites in French Polynesia.

Haoa said he can't prove he was contaminated, nor confirm his suspicions about his children's causes of death, because the French have refused to release his medical records for his period of work from 1963 through 1977.

While the French government claims the radioactive fallout was too little to harm workers or islanders, some experts say the lack of medical information tells them France has no proof the nuclear testing is safe.

Critics say the failure to provide answers to workers such as Haoa undermines the government's credibility in French Polynesia, where more than 80 percent of the 212,000 residents are Polynesian or part-Polynesian. It has also contributed to growing worldwide opposition to the current underground testing, which began with a first test Sept. 5 at Mururoa atoll, 750 miles southeast of Tahiti. A second test was done beneath Fangataufa atoll Oct. 1. The French plan up to eight tests through next spring.

More than 10,000 civilians and military personnel worked at Mururoa and Fangataufa atolls, the site of 41 nuclear atmospheric tests between 1966 and 1974. But bound by a code of silence they signed while applying for jobs, most have avoided publicity.

Haoa and 53 other former workers who witnessed the nuclear tests stepped forward recently, when France announced its resumption of nuclear tests in French Polynesia.

"Some of them have seen their friends die of unknown causes," said Oscar Temaru, mayor of the poor working-class district Faava.

**CANCER RATES HIGHER**

A report by the group "Centre de Documentation & Recherche sur la Paix et les Conflits," which translates center of documentation and research on peace and conflict, indicates leukemia and thyroid cancer rates were significantly higher in French Polynesia than other Pacific island nations.

The group's facts come from compiling cancer incidence rates from the South Pacific Commission. Among French Polynesian women the incidence of thyroid cancer was 17.6 cases per 100,000 population in 1989-90, compared with 8.6 for Fijian women in 1990 and 10.5 for Hawaii women from 1978-1982.

Maire Masson, 38, a Tahitian woman who had a thyroid operation at 19, wants to know if her illness and similar health problems in her family are hereditary or a result of nuclear fallout.

"When I ask one doctor, he says, 'It's hereditary.' When I ask another, he says, 'No, it's not hereditary,'" Masson said.

Haoa said the doctors at the French government hospital did not list the cause of deaths for his five children—and when he told them he thought it was due to his work at the nuclear sites, they told him he was crazy.

But he recalled one physician taking him aside and saying that if he wanted the real answers, he would have to get them at medical facilities in a different country.

**RECORD-KEEPING CRITICIZED**

While France has spent millions of dollars on nuclear tests, its gathering of health statistics in French Polynesia during the early years of nuclear testing has been sorely lacking, critics say.

The official cancer registry of French Polynesia has existed only since 1985. As late as 1988, only 60 percent of cancers were being recorded in French Polynesia, critics say.

Death certificates became compulsory after 1981 but the cause of death is not always listed.

"The statistics are very badly gathered and very badly used," said Marie-Therese Danielsson, author of the book "Poisoned Reign," published in 1986.

Until 1985, the main hospital in French Polynesia was controlled by the military. Patients who had major medical problems were flown to France.

The physicians group *Medecins Sans Frontieres*, has charged that the French government failed to fulfill its ethical responsibility toward those potentially at risk from atmospheric testing.

The group, in its review of information this year, said no reliable health statistics were available to see if people were adversely affected as a result of 41 atmospheric tests.

"If such data do exist, they are not available in the public domain," the group said.

The group in July recommended French Polynesia improve its registry of cancer patients, publish all available facts on the health of French nuclear workers, and track the health of the general population.

It also called for improving health care access for residents of Gambier and Tureia, islands close to Mururoa.

Roger Ducoussou, director of radiological protection for the French defense department, said he doesn't think medical tests for the people in French Polynesia are necessary.

Ducoussou said the radioactive fallout was so low in dosage that there is no possibility of chromosome damage.

Ducoussou said the high rate of thyroid cancer among Polynesians in French Polynesia is an ethnic characteristic and is common among Polynesians in Hawaii, New Caledonia and New Zealand. He said during the years of testing at Mururoa and Fangataufa, no one died or got sick from radioactivity.

**CASE MAY BE HARD TO PROVE**

Haoa disagrees but doesn't know if he'll ever be able to prove it. He knows information about his health was recorded while he was working at the nuclear test sites. He said he took a physical every three weeks, including a blood test.

Haoa, who claims he witnessed more than 30 atmospheric tests, recalled viewing one from about 45 miles away that produced a mushroom cloud rising more than 1,300 feet.

He and other workers would return to the test sites a few hours to a few days later, depending on the wind direction. He wore a special suit to shovel sand over contaminated areas. Later, he and other workers built walls and bunkers over the sandy areas.

At Fangataufa, employees who arrived by air went into an enclosure and entered a bus

to travel to parts of the atoll. Signs outside warned workers not to walk across the lagoon. One day, a friend did. That night, his friend died, Haoa recalled.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Oct. 9, 1995]

#### FRANCE CLAIMS NO RADIATION INCREASE FROM TEST

PARIS.—France said today that its recent test of a nuclear warhead with the explosive force of just below 110,000 tons of TNT had not raised radiation levels at its Fangataufa atoll testing site in the South Pacific.

Measurements taken at the site in French Polynesia found the same low "background" level of radioactivity after the Oct. 1 test as before the blast, European Affairs Minister Michel Barnier wrote to EU Environment Commissioner Ritt Bjerregaard.

The level of radioactivity on the atoll corresponds to weak natural background levels, Barnier said in his letter to Bjerregaard, which was sent on Friday.

A copy of the letter has been released by the French Foreign Ministry.

Bjerregaard has complained that France prevented European Commission experts from visiting Fangataufa and refused to turn over data on radioactivity in the water and marine life around the Mururoa atoll, where the first French nuclear test in the current series took place on Sept. 5.

Barnier, in his letter, dismissed her complaints, saying the commission experts were allowed to visit more sites than had initially been planned and were given all the data they sought.

[From the Congressional Research Service, the Library of Congress, Washington, DC]

Source: *Le Monde*, August 2, 1995, n.p.

#### PARIS PUBLISHES FIRST LIST OF ITS NUCLEAR TESTS

François Mitterrand was the first French President to authorize a greater number. More than two hundred shots since 1960, three caused initial contamination.

France has just published for the first time a complete and detailed list of her nuclear tests since 1960, the date of the first test in the Sahara. This list, which contains the code name for each operation, the hour of the explosion, place and explosive power released has been published in a general survey (three volumes and a fourth in preparation) of nearly 670 pages published jointly by the Administration of Military Applications (DAM) for the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and the management of the Centers for Nuclear Experimentation (DIRCEN). It appears that in toto France has had 240 launches, of which 12 are classified. It was François Mitterrand who was the one of all the heads of state during the Fifth Republic to order the—by far—the greatest number of tests.

In the Sahara between February 1960 and February 1966, France initiated 17 launches in all (four atmospheric tests and 13 underground tests at the bottom of a mine in a mountain. In Polynesia, between July 1966 and July 1991, France undertook 175 tests (41 in the atmosphere and 78 underground ones in shafts dug in the crown of coral atolls and 56 underground ones in shafts sunk into the lagoon.) The Mururoa Atoll was used for the greatest number of shots (163). There were also 12 tests carried out on Fangataufa, about 40 kilometers away.

#### TWELVE "SECURITY" SHOTS

Of all the tests three were of the same kind: It concerned dropping a life-size weapon from a plane (a Mirage IV, a Mirage III-E, and a Jaguar) in July 1966, in August of 1973, and in July, 1974 several dozen kilo-

meters away from Mururoa Atoll. These gravitational weapons were the NA-22 (60 kilotons) and the AN-52 (20 kilotons) then in use in the French Air Force. There were replaced by the ASMO missile, weighing 300 kilotons.

To the above total must be added 12 security experiments on Mururoa between July 1966 and November 1989. The security shots were intended to verify whether the weapon was safe, i.e., that it would not explode inopportunely when subjected to external pressures of shock, uncontrolled vibrations, or fire. Security bolts are thought to be able to stop the launching of the weapon. These bolts also have a more political purpose, as the head of the government is the one who in the last resort would be the one to start the nuclear conflagration—if need be—by raising the bolts by remote control.

Most of the tests, including the Sahara ones, were moderate- or low-energy ones. So, just to stay with Polynesia, 63 tests (18 atmospheric tests and 45 underground ones) developed a force of between 5 to 20 kilotons (the energy emitted at Hiroshima was about 18 kilotons). Likewise 56 tests (11 atmospheric and 45 underground) were between 20 and 200 kilotons. Finally 54 tests (10 atmospheric and 44 underground) emitted energy between 150 and 1000 kilotons. Only three atmospheric shots (the first in May of 1968 on Fangataufa, and the second in August of the same year on Mururoa) developed very high energy, higher than a megaton.

The tests, according to AEC engineers caused initial contamination. The first, named "Ganymede" was an atmospheric shot under a balloon on Mururoa in July 1966. The second, called "Rigel" was an atmospheric (the bomb was put on a barge) in September 1966 on Fangataufa. The third one, called "Parthenope" was an atmospheric shot under a balloon [sous ballon] in August 1973 on Mururoa. The areas had to be decontaminated, i.e., surface sediments freed from radioactivity.

The comparisons undertaken afterwards by French technicians with the news being broadcast at the time by the New Zealanders—at the time France issued no statements concerning the testing—show that the method of detection using seismic sensors at a distance from the explosion is not reliable.

#### THREE TIMES MORE THAN DE GAULLE

If the error in assessing energy is greater than 100 percent in 20 percent of cases, which means that the detection by New Zealand stations of the shock caused by the underground test overestimated by a factor of two the actual power of the bomb tested in Polynesia. This method of oversight is, at present, the only one available, if you exclude direct espionage on test sites themselves or in the laboratories which subsequently use the results obtained. Its non-reliability could prove to be disturbing in the long run during discussions on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in Geneva, in dealing with countries likely to carry out clandestine low-energy tests in areas difficult to reach or prohibited from any one site control.

A final observation may be made from this information, published for the first time from an official French source. Between February of 1960 and August of 1968 (there were no tests in 1969), General De Gaulle authorized 30 shots: the 17 recorded in the Sahara and 13 more in Polynesia. Between July 1981 and July 1991 (the moratorium was declared in April 1992), Francois Mitterrand ordered 86 tests. During a period of time comparable enough for the two men, give or take a few months—Mitterrand undertook roughly three times the number of tests than did the founder of the Fifth Republic and theoretician of dissuasion.

However, despite this pronuclear zeal, history will no doubt remember that in 1992, Mitterrand decreed without prior consultation with the administration, chiefs of staff or AEC officials a unilateral suspension of French tests, which General de Gaulle defied the international community by deciding in 1960 to launch the first French tests in the Sahara, while the United States (and hence Great Britain, which tested on American territory) and the ex-Soviet Union were observing a joint moratorium.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). The Chair at this time before entertaining a motion to adjourn, will declare a recess.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 1 o'clock a.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2491, 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-292), on the resolution (H. Res. 245) providing for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair wishes to inform the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that after midnight, it is not in order to proceed for 5 minutes under the special order arrangement, but the gentleman is recognized for 1 minute and the Chair would like to inform the gentleman that he will be very generous with the 1 minute.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the rule that we have just filed is the enabling legislation to bring the so-called reconciliation bill to the floor, which will guarantee that this body is going to act fiscally responsible for the next 7 years and bring about a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair knows, and I know, that the single most serious problem facing this Nation today is the

deficits that are literally turning this Nation into a debtor nation. We are, in effect, no better off than a Third World debtor nation today because of it.

I came here in 1978, 2 years before you, Mr. Speaker, and that great President, Ronald Reagan who arrived here in 1980, and we at that time started the Reagan Revolution to shrink the size and the power of the Federal Government and return that power to the States and to the countries, towns, villages, cities, and local school districts, and to the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, we could not quite accomplish it, because we did not have control of the House and the Senate. Ronald Reagan, being the leader that he was, was forced to compromise and never succeeded in doing what we are doing here today.

Today, Mr. Speaker, you and I and the Republican leadership in both the House and the Senate, we now have the votes to pass this kind of legislation which is going to restructure this Federal Government. It is going to shrink its size and we are going to set that example throughout this entire country where we are going to have less government, less bureaucratic regulation, so that business and industry can strive and be successful in creating jobs and making profits in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Chair's indulgence in letting me speak this morning.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mrs. CLAYTON, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. OWENS, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. WISE, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. GENE GREEN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mrs. THURMAN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Ms. JACKSON-LEE, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. DOGGETT, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. SANDERS, today, for 5 minutes.  
Ms. DELAURO, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. STUPAK, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. PALLONE, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. ROEMER, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. MILLER of California, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH, today, for 5 minutes.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. BEREUTER, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. HORN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. KIM, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. DUNCAN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. MARTINI, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, October 31 for 5 minutes and November 1 for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. BROWNBACK, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. BARR, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DURBIN, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHAYS, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HILLIARD, today, for 5 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.  
Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.  
Mr. MILLER of California.  
Mr. SERRANO in eight instances.  
Mr. COLEMAN.  
Mrs. LOWEY.  
Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.  
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.  
Mr. MARKEY.  
Mr. GEPHARDT.  
Mr. SANDERS.  
Mr. VENTO.  
Mr. LANTOS.  
Mr. STOKES.  
Mr. FARR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONO.  
Mr. SHUSTER.  
Mr. BASS.  
Mr. CAMP in three instances.  
Mr. GOODLING.  
Mr. RAMSTAD.  
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.  
Mr. MARTINI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TAUZIN.  
Ms. FURSE.  
Mr. OWENS.  
Mrs. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
Mr. BARCIA.  
Mr. FARR of California.  
Mr. ORTON.  
Mr. STOKES.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, October 26, 1995, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken

from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1555. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's report on mixed waste, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6965; to the Committee on Commerce.

1556. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Commerce.

1557. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. B-96 which relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in section 36(b)(1) AECA certifications 91-03 of June 11, 1991, and 94-017 of February 28, 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5); to the Committee on International Relations.

1558. A letter from the Chairperson, Navy Exchange Service Command, transmitting the Navy Exchange Service Command retirement trust for plan year 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1559. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a copy of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers flood plain management assessment of the Upper Mississippi and Lower Missouri Rivers and their tributaries [FPMA]; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1560. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to suspend a special pay agreement for physicians and dentists who enter residency training programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LIGHTFOOT: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2020. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-291). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 245. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for reform of the Social Security earnings limit, and providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 (Rept. 104-292). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RADANOVICH:  
H.R. 2528. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to renew to the heirs of permittees permits for historic cabins located in the Mineral King Addition of the Sequoia

National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 2529. A bill to increase by 800 percent the duty on imports of beaujolais wine that is the product of France; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ORTON (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BROWDER, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SABO, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. ROEMER):

H.R. 2530. A bill to provide for deficit reduction and achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Financial Services, Commerce, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Government Reform and Oversight, House Oversight, the Judiciary, National Security, Resources, Rules, Transportation and Infrastructure, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. CANADY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. EWING, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2531. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption for houseparents from the minimum wage and maximum hours requirements of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. MINGE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2532. A bill to provide marketing loans and a total acreage base for the 1996 through 2002 crops of upland cotton, feed grains, rice, oilseeds, and wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself and Mrs. SCHROEDER) (both by request):

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to establish the U.S. Intellectual Property Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KINCHEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to treatment of corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, National Security, Science, Resources, Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Banking and Financial Services, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 2535. A bill to provide for withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. SMITH of Washington (for herself and Mrs. CHENOWETH):

H.R. 2536. A bill to terminate certain entitlements of former Speakers of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. HASTERT (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FOX, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HEINEMAN, and Mr. BARR):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for raising the Social Security earnings limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STARK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BEIL-ENSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FROST, Mr. OBEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the current Federal alternative minimum tax requiring all corporations and individuals with substantial economic income to pay minimum taxes should be retained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 2537. A bill to provide for the reliquidation of certain entries of imported chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 244. Resolution to direct the Speaker to provide an appropriate remedy in response to the use of a forged document at a subcommittee hearing; laid on the table.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 528: Mr. KLINK, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 663: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 784: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 835: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 862: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 922: Mr. FRANK of MASSACHUSETTS, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1033: Mr. DURBIN and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1229: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1274: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1353: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 1483: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1496: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1514: Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 1540: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1619: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1787: Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 1821: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1883: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1946: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1950: Mr. WARD.

H.R. 1951: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1970: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2011: Mr. ANDREWS, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FOX, Mr. FILNER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. BRYANT of Texas.

H.R. 2098: Mr. UPTON and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 2180: Mr. STUMP, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 2200: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. COX, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NEY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2205: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 2249: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2261: Mr. OLVER, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2270: Mr. TATE, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 2276: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. KIM, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2333: Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 2342: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 2351: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 2364: Mr. COOLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2429: Mr. HOYER and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2463: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2507: Mr. SALMON and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.J. Res. 70: Mr. THOMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. DIXON.